UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.3095
15 July 1992

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE THOUSAND AND NINETY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 15 July 1992, at 3 p.m.

President:	Mr. JESUS	(Cape Verde)
Members:	Austria	Mr. HOHENFELLNER
	Belgium	Mr. NOTERDAEME
	China	Mr. LI Daoyu
	Ecuador	Mr. AYALA LASSO
	France	Mr. MERIMEE
	Hungary	Mr. ERDOS
	India	Mr. GHAREKHAN
	Japan	Mr. HATANO
	Morocco	Mr. BENJELLOUN-TOUIMI
	Russian Federation	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mr. PERKINS
	Venezuela	Mr. ARRIA
	Zimbabwe	Mr. SHAMUYARIRA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE QUESTION OF SOUTH AFRICA

LETTER DATED 2 JULY 1992 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF MADAGASCAR TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/24232)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Barbados, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Germany, Indonesia, Lesotho, Malaysia, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire and Zambia, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda.

In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ka (Senegal) and Mr. Pik Botha (South Africa) took places at the Council table; Mr. Brahimi (Algeria), Mr. Pedro de Castro Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Hurst (Antigua and Barbuda), Mr. Butler (Australia), Mr. Maycock (Barbados), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Sardenberg (Brazil), Mr. Frechette (Canada), Mr. Ganga (Congo), Mr. Mujica Cantelar (Cuba), Mr. Moussa (Egypt), Mr. Graf Zu Rantzau (Germany), Mr. Wisnumurti (Indonesia), Mr. Phoofolo (Lesotho), Mr. Razali (Malaysia), Mr. Huaraka (Namibia), Mr. Acharya (Nepal), Mr. Van Schaik (Netherlands), Mr. Willberg (New Zealand), Mr. Nwachuku (Nigeria), Mr. Huslid (Norway), Mr. Luna (Peru), Mr. Mendez (Philippines), Miss Mendes (Portugal), Mr. Yañez Barnuevo (Spain), Mr. Nandoe (Suriname), Mr. Osvald (Sweden), Mr. Ssemogerere (Uganda), Mr. Batiouk (Ukraine), Mr. Nyakyi (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya (Zaire) and Mr. Musuka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 10 July 1992 from the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request the United Nations Security Council to permit me to participate in my capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, under the provisions of rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, in the Council's consideration of the item entitled 'The question of South Africa'".

On previous occasions, the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 13 July 1992 from the Permanent Representative of Zimbabwe to the United Nations, which reads as follows:

> "As a member of the Security Council, I have the honour to request that during its meetings devoted to consideration of the item entitled 'The question of South Africa', the Security Council, under rule 39 of

(The President)

its provisional rules of procedure, extend an invitation to Dr. Salim A. Salim, Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity (OAU)."

That letter has been published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/24283. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 to Dr. Salim.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 13 July 1992 from the Permanent Representative of Zimbabwe to the United Nations, which reads as follows:

> "As a member of the Security Council, I have the honour to request that during its meetings devoted to consideration of the item entitled 'The question of South Africa', the Security Council, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, extend an invitation to Mr. Clarence Makwetu, President of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania."

That letter has been published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/24284. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 to Mr. Makwetu.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 13 July 1992 from the Permanent Representative of Zimbabwe to the United Nations, which reads as follows:

> "As a member of the Security Council, I have the honour to request that during its meetings devoted to consideration of the item entitled 'The question of South Africa', the Security Council, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, extend an invitation to

(The President)

Mr. Nelson Mandela, President of the African National Congress of South Africa."

That letter has been published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/24285. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 to Mr. Mandela.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 14 July 1992 from the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations, which reads as follows:

"The following participants in CODESA have to date indicated their desire to take part in the debate in the Security Council on 15 July 1992 on the situation in South Africa.

"Dr. Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi

"Mr. Lucas M. Mangope

"Brigadier Oupa J. Gqozo

"Dr. J. N. Reddy

"Mr. E. Joosab

"Mr. Kenneth M. Andrew

"Mr. E. E. Ngobeni.

"It would be appreciated if you could enable the above-mentioned to address the Council as, in terms of rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, they will be able to supply the Council with information and give it assistance in explaining matters within its competence."

That letter has been published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/24287. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the

(The President)

Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 to Dr. Buthelezi, Mr. Mangope, Brigadier Gqozo, Dr. Reddy, Mr. Joosab, Mr. Andrew and Mr. Ngobeni.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

(The President)

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in response to the request contained in a letter dated 2 July 1992 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Madagascar to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, contained in document S/24232.

I should also like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/24255, which contains the text of a letter dated 8 July 1992 from the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

The first speaker inscribed on my list is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal, His Excellency Mr. Djibo Laity Ka, who wishes to make a statement on behalf of the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). I welcome His Excellency and invite him to make his statement.

Mr. KA (Senegal) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, because of the age-old ties of friendship and cooperation that bind your country, Cape Verde, with Senegal, we are particularly pleased to see you presiding over this meeting of the Security Council.

We are all the more pleased that, as an eminent son of Africa, you are especially aware of the singular dedication of the peoples and leaders of our continent, Africa, to the cause of justice in South Africa.

On behalf of President Abdou Diouf, current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, and on behalf of the ministerial delegation of the OAU, which I have the honour to lead, I should like to convey to all members of the Council our sincere thanks for the promptness with which they acceded to the

(Mr. Ka, Senegal)

OAU's request, after President Nelson Mandela's request, to hold an urgent meeting of the Security Council to take up in particular the violence currently besetting South Africa.

In so doing, the Security Council is providing eloquent testimony, which we fully appreciate, to its interest in and the importance it attaches to one of our most pressing concerns.

To the Secretary-General of our Organization, our brother and friend, Mr. Boutros-Ghali, whose skill and moral qualities are recognized by one and all, we should like to reiterate our heartfelt congratulations and our support in the performance of his lofty and noble mission.

A few days ago, the Heads of State or Government of the countries members of the OAU, at a summit meeting in Dakar, deemed it essential to request the Council to convene an urgent meeting on the situation in South Africa.

More specifically, the OAU called on the Security Council to examine the issue of violence in South Africa and to take all appropriate action to put an end to it. At the same time, the OAU expressed the ardent wish for the United Nations to become involved in exploring and creating conditions conducive to the resumption of negotiations, once the climate of violence and uncertainty had been removed, to secure South Africa's commitment to a peaceful political transition.

Africa as a whole is deeply concerned by the turn of events in South Africa. As recently as four months ago, the white South African minority gave President De Klerk a mandate to continue his efforts to put an end once and for all to apartheid by negotiating with all South African political parties and movements the framework towards a peaceful transition to a democratic and non-racial South Africa.

(Mr. Ka, Senegal)

At that time, we quite naturally welcomed this stance, which we felt heralded the advent of a new era that would lead South Africa to a reconciliation with itself and with other nations of the world, particularly African nations. We did so because we believed, and indeed continue to believe, that one of the most effective ways of rescuing South Africa from its lengthy period of sectarian strife and exclusion was and remains negotiation among all of the country's political forces, particularly those that are firmly resolved to dismantle the odious system of apartheid. We did so because we considered the results of the 17 March referendum to be a clear indication of the white minority's determination to continue to the end the beneficial undertaking begun under CODESA which, we feel, remains the appropriate framework for peacefully organizing a democratic transition in South Africa, bearing in mind that the final goal is the creation of a democratic, non-racial and egalitarian democracy.

But today, to our great regret, the country has been plunged into an atmosphere of unacceptable violence, which the Boipatong tragedy has significantly worsened.

The Boipatong massacre, which occurred three months to the day after the 17 March referendum, has provided a very clear illustration of the precariousness of the political situation as well as of the grave dangers still threatening South Africa's future. The massacre of innocent people and physical violence have become the daily lot of millions of South Africans, who live in fear of their homes being broken into and of their family and individual integrity being attacked.

(Mr. Ka, Senegal)

Under these circumstances, it is clearly impossible to go on with any kind of credible negotiating process. That is why South Africa has reached a dangerous impasse.

Henceforth, we cannot rule out - even if we do not want to face up to it - the possibility of a setback the consequences of which would be tragic for South Africa itself, for all the countries of the African continent and indeed for the entire international community.

(Mr. Ka, Senegal)

What is happening in South Africa? What is happening is that the system of apartheid - which is the denial of everything that goes to make up human dignity, the negation of everything that can enable men to exercise their attributes as citizens - has spawned a situation of structural violence, including the Boipatong massacre, which is the culmination of a process that started long ago and is the saddest, most tragic and most reprehensible illustration of that process.

What is happening is that in South Africa some citizens, feeling that they can act with impunity, something that is difficult to explain and still more difficult to justify, are almost daily massacring others as they see fit. Nothing is being done by those whose job it is to govern and administer the country to put an end to their actions and to punish with all necessary severity the perpetrators of these reprehensible acts of gratuitous violence.

How can we conceive, how can we accept, that those responsible for conducting the affairs of a country can stand idly by in the face of such a state of affairs? It is the prime responsibility of any Government, however limited its representative nature, to guarantee the security of people and material, safeguard individual integrity and create a climate of civil peace, unless that Government clearly acknowledges its inability to perform that function.

Therefore, the Organization of African Unity believes that the South African Government must be made to shoulder its responsibilities, which it alone must assume if it wishes to remain credible. Of course, all the parties that believe in the possibility of setting up a democratic regime in South Africa must work for the elimination of all forms of violence.

(Mr. Ka, Senegal)

The situation prevailing in South Africa is not only unacceptable, but is above all dangerous for South Africa itself and beyond its frontiers. That is why we seek the support of the United Nations to place obstacles in the way of a minority that yearns for a past that has gone, a minority whose main object is to stop the negotiating process leading to the dawn of a democratic, non-racial South Africa by creating a climate of terror and intolerable insecurity.

Our approach to the Council is also based on two findings. The first is that of Judge Goldstone, who, because he enjoys the confidence of the main political forces in South Africa, was appointed Chairman of the Commission of Inquiry on the prevention of violence and public intimidation. In his report of 27 May this jurist declared:

> "Although in February 1990 a climate of violent change was replaced by a climate of non-violent change in the situation in South Africa, the disturbances and the violence have since then reached a pitch unequaled in the history of South Africa."

The second finding is that there have already been several commissions of inquiry on the violence in South Africa. They are the Goldstone Commission, an internal Commission; the International Commission of Jurists, which published a report last March; and the observer mission from the Organization of African Unity, which reported to the last session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization, held in Dakar two weeks ago at the end of June. All those commissions reached the same conclusion, that violence is gradually eroding South African society and is causing serious security problems.

Unfortunately, despite their determination to serve the cause of peace and also despite their noteworthy work, none of the commissions had the

(Mr. Ka, Senegal)

necessary authority to turn its conclusions into binding directives. Just after the Boipatong massacre, Judge Goldstone deplored the fact that his recommendations

> "were not followed up for if they had been it would have been possible to avoid that deplorable tragedy".

On the basis of those conclusions the Organization of African Unity believed that the Security Council, which is the highest body responsible for maintaining international peace and security, was the best possible place to seek a solution to the crisis, which, if it continues, threatens to spill over the frontiers of South Africa and threaten peace and security in the region.

More specifically, we believed that the Council could, among other things, in agreement with all the parties concerned, provide a United Nations presence in South Africa with the aim, *inter alia*, of helping to consolidate the measures to combat violence, to restore a climate of security and to explore and create conditions in which it would be possible to relaunch the negotiating process within CODESA. Finally ending violence is undoubtedly one of the ways to bring about a resumption of the negotiations, which we encourage. That is the main purpose of the draft resolutions submitted for consideration by the Council.

Some time ago the United Nations made the problem of South Africa its own problem. Both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly the Organization has adopted many resolutions on the basis of its regular assessment of the situation in the country.

(Mr. Ka, Senegal)

Today, when the situation has developed to a crucial point, we believe that the United Nations should again take up the matter to help identify the causes of the violence and to take the necessary steps to put an end to it.

As for ways and means of bringing about in South Africa the international presence that we have mentioned, we believe that, as is reflected in our draft resolution, that the designation by the Secretary-General of a Special Representative might well be a solution, it being understood that we hope that the Council will remain seized of the question until the establishment of a democratic, united and non-racial South Africa.

The Special Representative should have a broad mandate, responding to the concern expressed by the OAU, which led it to ask for this urgent meeting of the Security Council. If he is to perform his mission with the necessary effectiveness, the Special Representative should have the open, faithful and honest cooperation of all the parties concerned. In this connection, we are encouraged that the principle of having such a presence is accepted by the main political forces in South Africa, including the Government of South Africa.

That feeling of encouragement is strengthened by the recent statement of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in which he indicated that the Organization was prepared to play role in South Africa. We invite the Council to take a decision along those lines.

(Mr. Ka, Senegal)

Our presence here today in the Council, with a large ministerial delegation from the OAU, which was dispatched by President Abdou Diouf, current Chairman of the OAU, means that he, the current Chairman of the OAU, and with him all the Heads of State or Government of our continent, have made their choice, faced with the implacable alternative: that is either to work to create the conditions for a climate of security, in which violence would be ended once and for all, or to allow South Africa to become forever bogged down in an atmosphere of violence and terror which might well jeopardize the positive achievements of our common efforts to dismantle apartheid.

Africa's choice is the one dictated by reason and common sense - that is to say the one which, through peaceful and responsible methods, should lead to a peaceful transition in South Africa in order to set up in South Africa a democratic political system within a State of law.

The odious massacre in Boipatong, the culmination of a tragic process of violence and confrontation, however reprehensible it may be - and we did condemn it with all due firmness - should not make us deviate from this path. Those who undoubtedly were perhaps a little too optimistic have had proved to them the fact that caution is still necessary.

As far as we are concerned, we remain convinced that all men and women of good will, all those who throughout the world love peace, justice and progress, will be at our side, on the side of Africa, in these difficult times.

We have no doubt that the United Nations Security Council, in which the Charter has vested specific responsibilities as the guarantor of peace and security for the entire international community, will support us in this work of peace.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is Mr. Nelson Mandela, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MANDELA: First of all, we would like to express our appreciation to the Security Council for agreeing to meet on the question of South Africa. We would also like to thank members most sincerely for giving us the opportunity to address the Council.

The United Nations has been seized of the question of South Africa for the past 45 years. The reason for this is that our people have been subjected to the policy of apartheid, which the United Nations has determined is a crime against humanity.

The decisions which have been taken by the Security Council and the General Assembly on the question of South Africa have been directed at ending this apartheid crime against humanity and helping to transform our country into a non-racial democracy. This objective has not yet been achieved. South Africa continues to be governed by a white minority regime. The overwhelming majority of our people are still denied the vote. They remain deprived of the right to determine their destiny.

Representatives of the South African Government will also address the Council today. However sweet sounding the words they may utter, they represent the system of white minority rule to which the United Nations is opposed. They continue to govern our country under a constitution which the Security Council has declared null and void.

(Mr. Mandela)

Precisely because its purposes have not yet been achieved, the United Nations must remain seized of the question of South Africa. It must continue to look for ways and means by which it can help to expedite the process leading to the democratic transformation of our country.

In the meantime, an extremely critical situation has arisen. Whereas in the Declaration of Intent adopted at the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) on 21 December 1991 we all committed ourselves to set in motion the process whereby a Constitution would be drafted and adopted for a united, democratic, non-racial and non-sexist South Africa, the process is deadlocked.

With regard to this matter, the problem is that the ruling white minority government continues to look for ways and means by which it can guarantee itself the continued exercise of power, regardless of its electoral support. The regime insists that the political majority, no matter how large, should be subjected to veto by minority political parties. Unless government is forthcoming with a firm commitment to full democracy based on internationally accepted principles, and an acceptance of a sovereign and democratic constitution-making body, the process will not move forward.

But the Council meets today because this process has been brought to a halt by the carnage in the black townships. Over the last five to six years, at least 11,000 people have died as a result of this violence. During the month of June 1992 alone there have been 373 deaths and 395 injuries; and 1,806 have been killed and 2,931 injured during the period January 1992 to June 1992.

(Mr. Mandela)

Control of State power by the National Party regime allows it the space to deny and cover up its own role as well as those of its surrogates and the State security forces in fostering and fomenting the violence. Our memorandum of 9 July 1992 to Mr. F. W. De Klerk, which has been made available to members of the Council, sets out the evidence of numerous acts of omission and commission, which bear out Government involvement in the violence. In particular, we draw the attention of members to one annexure of the memorandum entitled "Involvement of the Security Forces in the fomenting and escalation of violence", and another entitled "South African Government support for the Inkatha Freedom Party".

Many years of struggle, both inside and outside of South Africa, brought us to the point in 1989 when, in its consensus Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa, the General Assembly concluded that circumstances existed for a negotiated resolution of the South African situation. In that Declaration the General Assembly said that such negotiations should, as a result of agreements that would be entered into by the liberation movement and the Government, be conducted in an atmosphere free of violence.

We were and are in full agreement with these positions. They were adopted by the General Assembly precisely because it was correctly foreseen that the process of negotiations could not succeed while a virtual civil war raged in the country.

Pursuant to this objective, in August 1990 the ANC decided to suspend all armed actions. We did this unilaterally, both as a demonstration of our good faith and to help create an atmosphere free of violence. At the same time it was expected that, for its part, the regime would carry out various measures

(Mr. Mandela)

which would remove obstacles to negotiations, and that it would ensure that a proper climate for negotiations did in fact exist. Instead, as we have said, we have been confronted with an escalating spiral of violence.

An independent socio-political and development agency known as Community Agency for Social Enquiry (CASE) has prepared five reports with regard to the pattern of violence. One of these reports comes to the conclusion that

> "The violence appears to be switched on and off at strategic moments."

It continues:

> "Behind the scale of brutality ... is the clear evidence that the violence erupts at points when it most weakens the ANC and its allies and dies down dramatically when it would most harm the Government of F. W. de Klerk."

It then goes on to say that

> "Two political parties have clearly benefited from the Reef violence. The first is the National Party government ... . The second major beneficiary has been Inkatha."

Another report deals with the 13 attacks on funerals or funeral vigils which took place on the Reef between July 1990 and July 1991. This study concludes that there is

> "an overwhelming predominance of acts of aggression carried out by supporters of the Inkatha Freedom Party. Those attacks, moreover, are carried out with the active or passive support of the South African Police".

It is more than clear to us that this violence is both organized and orchestrated. It is specifically directed at the democratic movement, whose activists, members and supporters make up the overwhelming majority of its victims. It constitutes a cold blooded strategy of State terrorism intended to create the conditions under which the forces responsible for the introduction and entrenchment of the system of apartheid would have the possibility of imposing their will on a weakened democratic movement at the negotiations table.

However, as had been foreseen by this Organization, this violence also has the effect of making those very negotiations impossible. Already in April 1991, when this campaign of terror grew to new heights, we were left with no choice but to suspend the bilateral negotiations with the regime until it took various measures to address the question of violence.

It is now common cause that the agreements the Government reached with the ANC in May 1991 aimed at curbing the violence have not been carried out by the regime.

Faced with the horrendous escalation of the violence, as evidenced in the Boipatong massacre, occurring in the context of the negotiations deadlock, the ANC has been forced to withdraw from the multilateral process of negotiations which had been taking place in the Convention for a Democratic South Africa.

The blame for this lies squarely at the door of the regime. It, and nobody else, has the law enforcement personnel and the legal authority to stop this violence and to act against the perpetrators. As the governing authority, it has the obligation to protect the lives and property of all the people. It has failed dismally to do this.

The actions of the regime, including its persistent efforts to shift the blame for the violence and the responsibility to act against it to political organizations, have served to ensure the escalation of the carnage.

(Mr. Mandela)

Though the causes of this violence are many and complex, it is important that we should all have a clear perspective. It is the regime which controls State power with the capacity to bring the violence to an end. Complicity of State security forces is established by the evidence which emerged in numerous court trials, inquests and commissions and has been confirmed by the Goldstone Commission as well as reports of international fact-finding missions.

It is also clear that the central thrust of the violence is to weaken the ANC and the democratic movement of the country.

In the face of this situation, it is also true that there are instances of counter-violence by members of the democratic movement. At the same time, it is a matter of public record that the ANC policy stands opposed to the promotion of violence. We remain firmly committed to this position. But our task of ensuring that this policy position is fully and completely adhered to is made more than difficult because of the practice of the State security forces, its surrogates and the fact that it is the police controlled by the regime which remains in charge of investigating the violence, in which the State security forces are implicated, and bringing the perpetrators to book.

(Mr. Mandela)

The ANC maintains that the Government's culpability for the violence extends to acts of commission as well as omission. The International Commission of Jurists and Amnesty International have blamed the Government for failure to act against the violence. Amnesty International notes the Government's

> "failure to bring to justice all but a tiny proportion of those involved in human rights violations".

Judge Goldstone, in his report dated 6 July 1992, complains of several instances where the authorities have ignored the recommendations of his Commission.

Not a single person has been convicted in connection with the 49 massacres that claimed the lives of at least 10 people in each of the incidents that have occurred in the past two years in the Transvaal. Where there have been proper investigations and vigorous prosecutions, as resulted from the Trust Feed massacre of December 1988, convictions have been secured. Those convicted were policemen.

In 1985, Matthew Goniwe and three other Eastern Cape leaders were murdered. In May this year, in a document whose authenticity has not been challenged, a message from the South African Defence Force military intelligence chief, General C.P. Van der Westhuizen, then a Brigadier, proposed to the State Security Council that that body should authorize "the urgent removal from society" of Goniwe and the others. No move has been made to suspend Van der Westhuizen from his position.

(Mr. Mandela)

No action has been taken to suspend the head of the South African Police forensic laboratories, General Lothar Neethling, after a Supreme Court civil-case finding in January 1991 that his involvement in the poisoning of activists was, on the balance of probabilities, true.

Despite a judicial commission finding implicating several military personnel of the Civil Cooperation Bureau (CCB) in political violence, none has been charged. At least 20 Bureau members, and probably many more, remain on the South African Defence Force payroll. Others have been offered or have received huge pensions. Several have demanded immunity from prosecution.

In February 1992 it came to light that local white policemen based at the Ermelo police station encouraged and actively helped a gang of vigilantes in Wesselton. No policemen concerned has been suspended.

In an official operation in 1986, the South African Defence Force gave military training in Namibia to 200 Inkatha members who were later absorbed into the Kwa Zulu police. In sworn affidavits, several trainees claimed to have been trained in offensive warfare. The regime has dismissed this incident on the grounds that these Inkatha Freedom Party members had received VIP-protection training. Some of the trainees have subsequently been implicated in the violence in Natal.

No action has been taken to control and limit the powers of the Kwa Zulu police. Extensive evidence exists of Kwa Zulu police partiality and involvement in the violence in the province of Natal. Indeed, as recently as 1 July 1992 the powers of the same Kwa Zulu police have in fact been strengthened. From that date the South African police's Internal Stability Unit will act on unrest in Kwa Zulu only if called on to do so by the Kwa Zulu Police District Commissioner.

(Mr. Mandela)

In 1990, the Pretoria regime issued specific proclamations legalizing the carrying of dangerous weapons in public. This repealed a prohibition which had been in force since 1891. In other words, after the ANC and other organizations were unbanned in 1990, the Pretoria regime has created a situation in which hordes of men can spill out into the streets and enter public places carrying the most dangerous weapons. The Government is unable to explain why it virtually gave people the licence to kill and maim. It has never explained why its police and army regularly accompanied these killers to places of safety after many murderous rampages, and arrested nobody.

We charge, without equivocation, that there is a rational basis for these acts of omission on the part of the South African Government. The hard fact of the matter is that the South African Government has never relented in its war against the democratic movement of our country.

Recently, a covert police unit, operating in the area around Boipatong, came to public attention. It and 10 others operating in other regions of the country exist for the purpose of suppressing the democratic movement, which the Government still regards as the enemy and a threat to so-called national security. Former officers and personnel of the security police have been redeployed into these clandestine networks. There are persistent allegations that members of these units, as well as those in Special Force units composed of foreign nationals such as Angolans, Mozambicans and Namibians, are engaged in covert operations that include the assassination of leaders and activists of the democratic movement. They are also implicated in carrying out acts of terror against the population at large.

(Mr. Mandela)

In order to confuse the issue and evade its responsibilities, the Government insists that the source of the violence is rivalry between the ANC and the Inkatha Freedom Party. The fact of the matter, however, is that the Inkatha Freedom Party has permitted itself to become an extension of the Pretoria regime, its instrument and surrogate. Its activities have been financed by the South African Government. Its members have been armed and trained by the South African Government. There is an abundance of evidence that it continues to benefit from covert cooperation with the South African Government.

It therefore becomes unclear when its members are acting as an independent force and when as an agent on behalf of the South African Government. However, it is not an independent force with which the ANC must enter into an agreement to end the violence in the country, as the Pretoria regime asserts.

The documentation we will give to members of the Council details all the points we have raised, all of which confirm the criminal failure of the Government properly to address the question of political violence which has claimed too many lives already, which is tearing our country apart and which is making the process of negotiations impossible.

We would like to recall earlier decisions of this Council to help the people of South Africa to transform our country into a non-racial democracy. We believe that this commitment places an urgent obligation on the Council to intervene in the South African situation to end the carnage.

(Mr. Mandela)

The very interest of the Council to see the negotiations resumed so that a peaceful solution can be found, a solution that would be in keeping with the democratic principles contained in the General Assembly Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa of 1989 and the resolutions of the Security Council itself, requires of the Council that it act on this matter of violence in South Africa firmly and with the necessary speed.

We believe that this violence, like the system of apartheid itself, is a direct challenge to the authority of the Council and a subversion of its global tasks of furthering peace and promoting the objectives contained in both the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on Human Rights.

Failure on the part of the Council to act firmly and decisively cannot but undermine its prestige and authority at a time when the Council and the United Nations as a whole are called upon to play an even more active role in the ordering of world affairs.

We would therefore urge that the Council should request the Secretary-General to appoint a Special Representative on South Africa.

This representative should move speedily to investigate the situation in South Africa with a view to helping the Council to decide on the measures it should take to help us end the violence. The Council should then take the necessary decisions to implement such measures, including the continuous monitoring of the situation to ensure the effectiveness of such measures as it would have undertaken.

We should also like to bring it to the notice of the Council, for the purpose of its information, that we have required of the Government that it also complete the process of the release of political prisoners and the repeal of repressive legislation.

Again, these are concrete steps visualized in the United Nations Declaration to create a climate conducive to negotiations. That these matters remain on the agenda, more than two years after we entered into a formal agreement with the South African Government that they would be attended to, demonstrates the problem we face concerning the reliability of the Government in terms of implementing agreements it has entered into.

We should also like to take advantage of this opportunity to reaffirm our own commitment both to the process of negotiations and to a genuinely democratic outcome.

In this regard, we should again like to inform you that we still have to convince the Government that it also should be committed to such a democratic outcome, accepting such ordinary concepts of a democratic system as majority rule and the absence of vetoes by minority parties.

We therefore still have to overcome these obstacles so that the process of negotiations itself, as conducted within the Convention for a Democratic South Africa, can succeed.

We thank members for the opportunity they have given us to address the Council and hope that they will respond to our appeal to help us end the carnage in South Africa, with the understanding of the gravity of the situation which we know they share. Our people look forward to the Council's decisions with great expectation.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria, His Excellency Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi. I welcome His Excellency and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BRAHIMI (Algeria) (interpretation from Arabic): I have the distinct pleasure, on behalf of the Algerian delegation, to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Cape

Verde, the friendly country you represent, has always expressed a resolute commitment to the peoples who seek freedom and justice, and is a country with which Algeria enjoys outstanding relations.

Your personal qualifications and your competence have, for a long time now, won the esteem of your colleagues at the United Nations; they guarantee that the Security Council will enjoy wise leadership. Permit me also to greet your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Noterdaeme of Belgium, to whom I wish to pay particular tribute for the effective manner in which he presided over the deliberations of the Security Council last month.

I should also like to convey my congratulations to Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali and wish him every success in carrying out his noble task.

The presence of Mr. Nelson Mandela in this Chamber symbolizes the great progress made by the South African people in its long struggle for dignity; but I also wish to mention the grave dangers now threatening South Africa. I welcome Mr. Mandela and congratulate him on his statement before the Security Council; and at the same time I reaffirm Algeria's support for and solidarity with him in his pursuit of noble and just goals at the side of his brothers in the struggle.

My colleague and friend Mr. Djibo Ka, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal, has already expounded with eloquence upon the reasons why the African Heads of State, following the Dakar Summit, called for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to be devoted to the situation in South Africa. Permit me briefly to reiterate those reasons and to make clear what we as Africans expect of this convening of the Council.

(Mr. Brahimi, Algeria)

First of all, why this recourse to the United Nations? Quite simply, it is because our Organization has for more than 40 years worked to end what is an intolerable onslaught on human dignity and a violation of human rights - namely, racial discrimination.

In the General Assembly our debates on this question and the resolutions adopted there have been an invaluable contribution in bolstering the legitimate claims for equality and justice for the black majority of South Africa. It is, furthermore, this universal forum, following the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly, in 1989, which set forth the guiding principles for the peaceful elimination of apartheid and for the advent of a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa.

(Mr. Brahimi, Algeria)

The Security Council has spared no effort, as the repressive measures taken against the black majority have continued to be brutal and revolting. International sanctions, which are still in force, have been imposed in order to isolate the South African regime and prevail upon it to undertake a negotiating process aimed at ending racial discrimination.

The international pressure has finally become a determining factor. Considerable progress has been made since Mr. de Klerk came to power as the Head of the Government. First, the legal foundations of the apartheid regime have been gradually dismantled; secondly, most of the political prisoners have been released; and lastly, a promising negotiating process has been undertaken on the constitutional future of the country.

This progress, which would have been impossible without the courage and the spirit of compromise shown by Messrs. Mandela and de Klerk, went hand in hand with the support and encouragement offered by Africa and the entire international community.

Today, that crucial movement towards peace is in jeopardy. Violence, which has affected more than 10,000 victims in four years, has fanned the flames of passion and risks derailing the entire negotiating mechanism that was so laboriously established at the end of last year. The Boipatong massacre, which Algeria has strongly condemned, exemplifies the seriousness of the situation, one that we cannot accept, for whatever reason. This process came to an end, and the Dakar summit called on the Security Council to hold an urgent meeting.

I believe that the representatives in the Security Council could not possibly be satisfied with the facile explanation given - that of ethnic rivalry within the black majority. It simply does not stand up to scrutiny.

(Mr. Brahimi, Algeria)

There are serious indications that hidden, powerful and well-organized forces, which have accomplices within the security services, are fostering an escalating spiral of violence, fomenting ethnic differences and inciting bloody confrontations and acts of aggression against innocent people.

How else can we explain the assassination in recent months of many local leaders close to the ANC?

How can we otherwise justify the impunity enjoyed by hostel inmates, the perpetrators of deadly raids against the townships, which have traditionally favored the democratic movement? How else can we justify the complaisance of the forces of law and order with respect to the bearing of so-called "traditional" arms in public places, while they themselves have proved that these are deadly weapons, used against innocent people?

The South African Government, which is responsible for maintaining public order and security, must be firmly invited by the Council to exercise that responsibility without discrimination, and to set an example by charging and punishing the perpetrators of these criminal acts.

But that in itself will not suffice. The Government must also address the causes of violence in that country, which have already been identified. It is up to the Security Council to call upon it to adopt the following measures:

First, dissolution of private militias, which are out of control.

Secondly, implementation of the resolution that calls for the dismantling of the notorious "Battalion 32", which consists of foreign mercenaries and specializes in brutal repression in the townships.

Thirdly, purging the ranks of the police and the army of the most reactionary elements and promoting recruitment among the black majority.

(Mr. Brahimi, Algeria)

Fourthly, reinstatement of the ban on the bearing of arms in public places, including so-called "traditional" weapons.

Fifthly, conversion of hostels into family apartments and their integration into the townships.

Lastly, the Council should seriously consider inviting the Secretary-General to designate an eminent person as Special Representative for South Africa. That would bear witness to the international Organization's concern over the acts of violence that have led to the suspension of negotiations and its commitment to the resumption of the peace process leading to a democratic South Africa.

With respect to the mandate of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the African delegation present here, led by my friend from Senegal, stands ready to contribute to its framework.

In making this urgent appeal to the Security Council - one which my country is honored to endorse - Africa has not come to seek partisan support. Africa has come here to demand rapid and effective action to put an end to the shedding of innocent blood, to end the destruction and violence, and to re-establish the basis for a resumption of negotiations to bring peace and harmony to South Africa in a constitutional context, which can only be the work of South Africans themselves.

The African ministerial delegation has also come before this Council to reaffirm Africa's support of the democratic forces that, regardless of racial, cultural and linguistic differences, work towards a South Africa reconciled with itself - a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa.

(Mr. Brahimi, Algeria)

The Security Council being the body charged with ensuring respect for international law, we therefore expect its staunch support for the rights of South Africa to peace, security, democracy and freedom.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria for his kind words addressed to me.

I now invite the Minster for Foreign Affairs of Egypt to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): At the outset, Sir, I am pleased to salute you, a dear friend, a skilled Ambassador and a representative of a friendly country bound to Egypt by the closest ties of African unity. I also congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I believe the Security Council's consideration of the situation in South Africa under your presidency will allow us, through this debate, to attain the best possible results in favour of the peace and normalization processes in South Africa and of an end to the era of apartheid, with the violence, segregation and backwardness that it has allowed and continues to allow.

I also once again congratulate the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, not only on his election to his high post but also on his spirit of dedication and initiative.

As the Foreign Minister of Senegal said, we have come to the Security Council to consider the grave, negative developments in South Africa, which have been clearly and sincerely described by President Nelson Mandela. These are developments related to one of the most important issues facing the international community as a whole and, more specifically, Africa. It is an issue that raises many major questions.

First, on a national level, what is the truth about the reality of a strong political will to put a definitive end to the system of apartheid and to move towards a genuine democratic system, which would mean the beginning in South Africa of an era free from discrimination on the basis of colour, race, ethnic origin or religion?

The use of force or violence to sow fear and terror in the souls of people is most dangerous, because citizens have an increasing feeling that the

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

Government is either behind such acts or encourages them. I should like to obtain some clarification on this from Mr. Pik Botha, Foreign Minister of South Africa.

Secondly, on a regional and continental level, any talk of stability in Africa, any talk of the beginning of development in Africa, will be limited as long as the situation in South Africa remains grave through operations such as the one in Boipatong. It is true that there are many major problems in other parts of Africa, but there is one incontrovertible fact: the situation in South Africa is the most fundamental of Africa's problems. We are increasingly convinced that settling the situation in South Africa will release the forces of progress in Africa so that Africa may enter a new era of effective, positive participation in world affairs.

Thirdly, at the international level, the world is fast moving towards a new era in international relations. We do not believe that preparations for this new era can be completed unless conditions in Africa are corrected, whether with regard to the situation in South Africa or other areas of tension in the continent, or to development and economic progress. We believe that all these problems are related.

The African summit Conference in Dakar crystallized the African position on the subject before the Council, upon an initiative by the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), as did the arguments eloquently put forward by the Foreign Minister of Senegal as the President of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). The summit's resolution reaffirmed the African States' unanimous determination to face up to the situation in South Africa, a situation brought sharply into focus by the Boipatong events. The summit was determined to put

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

the issue before the international community, through the Security Council, in order to reaffirm the joint international obligation to face up to apartheid and put an end to it, the obligation to eliminate the obstacles to normalization on the way to the creation of a non-racial society, a society that provides justice and equality for all citizens of South Africa.

Egypt was determined to participate in this meeting as an expression of our strong position on the need to give priority to the situation in South Africa at this critical and sensitive time. As I have already said, we believe that the situation in South Africa has a bearing on the situation in Africa in general. Furthermore, we are convinced that ending the apartheid system will herald the introduction of a new era, a true starting-point in Africa's life, whether for individuals, communities, peoples or States.

While we condemn acts of violence, and particularly the events at Boipatong, that does not prevent our saying another word of truth: President De Klerk has taken the situation in South Africa forward with many positive, constructive steps. We encourage him to continue them and we call on him to stand firmly and sincerely against all those who seek to put obstacles in his way. While we welcome President De Klerk's role in the movement towards peace and progress, we pay tribute to the wise leadership of President Nelson Mandela and other leaders and militants in South Africa, whether in the ANC or PAC or in other groups of citizens looking forward to a tomorrow without discrimination.

We have witnessed and lived through a period of progress and development in South Africa and a move towards the end of apartheid. We do not want that movement to suffer regression or reversal. Indeed, Africans and non-Africans

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

refuse to allow such a regression or reversal to occur. The current process is the only means to save South Africa - whites, blacks and coloureds alike - from a dark future and to open the way towards fraternity and cooperation.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

We are called upon to take a number of measures today and to put a number of matters in their true context, including the following:

First, there is no alternative to ending the system of apartheid and replacing it with a non-racial democratic regime.

Secondly, the CODESA negotiations must be resumed as soon as possible. All parties concerned must be called upon to join those negotiations. All members of CODESA must realize that these negotiations are taking place within sight and sound of the entire world, which hopes for its success.

Thirdly, violence is the main obstacle - among other factors, naturally - in this process. A repetition of such events will lead to the reversal which we have already mentioned and which must be avoided.

Fourthly, the fundamental responsibility in facing up to acts of violence is squarely that of the Government which, like all other Governments, must control events when the peace and security of citizens is concerned, and that must take place within the rule of law and the principles of legitimacy. We call on that Government immediately to take all measures needed to curb all forces fighting against democratic change, while making clear that this must not be used as a pretext to return to the state of emergency which prevailed in the country in the past.

Fifthly, the cooperation of all parties is also a prerequisite. We call for that cooperation and trust that it will be forthcoming. We support the draft resolution of the African States, which condemns the acts of violence and places responsibility on the shoulders of the concerned authorities in South Africa and calls for cooperation towards implementation of the negotiations.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

We believe that the United Nations has an important role to play. A representative of the Secretary-General would have a positive effect. He would be able to follow up events and keep the United Nations in the picture on the latest developments so that the Security Council and the entire international community may be fully aware of what is taking place and fully capable of doing what is needed immediately to help.

In conclusion, the resumption of negotiations must remain the requisite interim objective. However, there is another objective, the final objective, the establishment of peace, democracy and equality, as well as the rule of the majority.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire, Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya. I welcome His Excellency and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): I should like to convey to you, Sir, our sincere congratulations on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council, particularly at this precise juncture in the month of July when the ministerial delegation of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) has been mandated to bring before you a burning issue concerning the situation in South Africa. Aware as we are of your moral and intellectual qualities, we are fully confident that your mission will be successfully fulfilled.

May I also address your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of Belgium, Ambassador Paul Noterdaeme, who as President of the

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

Council for the month of June, distinguished himself for the second time by his diplomatic talent in successfully discharging the mandate which was his during that month.

Our gratitude goes to all the members of the Council who agreed to accede to the request of the OAU to hold this meeting of the Security Council on the question of the violence in South Africa.

I should also like to thank the Secretary-General for the constant interest which he has evinced in the elimination of apartheid from South Africa and for the creation of a democratic regime in that country.

The tragic situation which is currently prevailing in South Africa following the slaughter at Boipatong led the twenty-eighth summit meeting of the OAU, recently held in Dakar, to request the convening of this meeting. The high representational level of the delegation dispatched by the OAU to take part in the present meeting of the Council is a clear demonstration of the confidence which the African continent places in the ability of the United Nations to forestall, to avoid and to resolve conflicts that pose a threat to international peace and security.

In Dakar, the Council of Ministers first gave particular attention to the representative of the Special Committee Against Apartheid. He emphasized that the South African regime was the origin of the difficulties encountered by CODESA. He earnestly appealed for the signing of a final agreement on the transition period to avoid, or at least to forestall, a possible confrontation between the oppressed majority and the white minority.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

The Council listened very closely to the statement made by the President of the African National Council (ANC), Mr. Nelson Mandela, who pointed out that agreement on the negotiating process under CODESA was not being respected by the current authorities. This agreement contemplates, *inter alia*, constitutional principles, the establishment of an interim government and the reinstatement of Bantustans.

It was agreed that the massacre of Boipatong had been perpetrated despite the fact that the police were warned in time but arrived at the scene five hours after the beginning of the slaughter and two hours after the departure of the assassins, which indicates, according to what we have heard, that the police had no intention of preventing the massacre and arresting the perpetrators, who were simply members of the notorious "*Koevoets*" of recent sinister memory in Namibia. The ANC even located the inn where the members of that ill-famed "*Koevoets*" were installed.

During the work of the 28th summit meeting of the OAU, the Heads of State and Government learned a great deal from President Makwetu of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) and from President Mandela himself, on the behaviour of the regime which, after having given signs of being commited to CODESA I was clearly negative and ambiguous with respect to CODESA II. This irresponsible conduct inevitably led to the tragedy which occurred in Boipatong.

Since the release by the Government of President de Klerk of the leader of the ANC, Mr. Nelson Mandela, our African delegations were impressed by the courageous and far-reaching political gestures made by the Government

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

officials and South African leaders, gestures to defuse political, racial and social tension among the various South African communities, gestures which brought us closer to the creation of a non-racial, democratic and free South Africa.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

Among these gestures, we could refer to the process pursued by the Government of President De Klerk in dismantling apartheid by repealing the Groups Areas Act and the Land Act. The amendments made by that Government to the law on internal security, which restricts the powers of arbitrary arrest and imprisonment without trial applied to the police, but unfortunately they did not eliminate such acts. A multi-party Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) was established as the ideal framework for dialogue and negotiation between the Government and all South African liberation movements without exception. There was the release, albeit incomplete, of political prisoners and, finally, there was the return, under the aegis of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, of political exiles to their country, South Africa.

Heartened by these various signs of goodwill, the international community believed that South Africa had resolutely embarked upon the path of irrevocable change. The international community responded in kind with gestures to ease economic pressure, bring about a relaxation in political relations and ease restrictions on sporting events.

Unfortunately, while dialogue was moving towards an agreement as part of the CODESA negotiating process, particularly regarding constitutional principles, the establishment of an interim government, the reintegration of the Bantustans, a new factor surfaced, which is the subject of the current meeting of the Security Council: violence.

In order to understand this state of violence, I think we really have to go back to the 1630s, when the first Boers landed on the coasts of Azania. The Hottentot, Bushman and Bantu communities accepted them, just as they accepted the French Huguenots who fled France, where they were persecuted by

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

the Roman Catholics. That is the plight of the indigenous blacks who, unfortunately, today are segregated on the land of their ancestors. The system of violence among blacks dates from that era and has become even more widespread today.

The sixteenth special session of the General Assembly, by adopting on 14 December 1989 its declaration entitled "Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences for Southern Africa", sought to denounce and forestall the vicious cycle of violence that took hold in South Africa, encouraged by apartheid.

The Organization of African Unity, which felt that something should be done, sent a mission to South Africa in order to investigate this vicious cycle of violence. Its report emphasized the obvious implication of those sympathizing with Inkatha, as well as certain elements of the South African security forces in the process of violence.

Currently South Africa is veiled in obscurity. At this meeting the Security Council should do everything possible to shed light on South Africa, which means that all the foundations of apartheid must crumble. These foundations are the Colour Bar Act, the Native Lands Act, the Separate Educational System, the Population Registration Act and the Bantu Education Act.

Now, what is happening on the spot - that is, in the political negotiations between the South African Government and the various components of South African nationalism?

In order for us to have a fuller understanding of the attitude of the regime and its accomplices, a number of points need to be clarified. First, in CODESA I, Africa and the world expected the advent of a democratic South

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

Africa that would be free once and for all from its revolting system of racism: apartheid. Unfortunately, the massacre of Boipatong, which is still fresh in our memory, quickly opened our eyes.

When we had reached the stage when the prospects of a negotiated settlement could be glimpsed on the horizon, the Boipatong massacre brutally reminded us that our optimism was a mere utopian dream. Boipatong suddenly made us aware of the abject and ignominious nature of the system of apartheid. To paraphrase Adolf Thiers, I think that in the South African tragedy "we have to take everything seriously and nothing tragically". Therefore, I believe that with the prospect of the resumption of CODESA the parties involved should identify the various factors involved in the conflict that pits the forces of progress and change against the acolytes of apartheid. The identification of those elements will make it possible to uproot the causes of conflict and to design a new strategy for relaunching the dialogue. The interim government, among other tasks, will have to organize free and democratic elections, in other words, elections where every individual, whatever the colour of his skin, will have the right to vote.

We have come to the Security Council with a profound hope that, under pressure from the international community, the South African Government will commit itself to the path leading to an effective cessation of violence which will thus make it possible for a resumption of the CODESA negotiations. We look forward to their favourable outcome.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

Obviously, therefore, the South African Government, which is responsible for maintaining the safety of persons and goods, should do everything it can to put an end to this senseless violence. I appeal to all components of South African political life to put an end to their antagonisms, to resist the manipulations that are encouraging them to use violence in their relations, and to commit themselves to building a united and brotherly South Africa. I hope that the parties involved will shortly resume their dialogue and that the unity of action and the cohesion between the liberation movements and other democratic forces of the patriotic front will be preserved. My delegation supports implementation of resolution 1386 (LVI) adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity which, inter alia, requests that a follow-up mission be sent to the Republic of South Africa as part of the negotiating process in order to put an end to violence.

My delegation regrets that the South African security forces are in collision with numerous sympathizers of the so-called Inkatha, thus creating violence in South Africa. Zaire has always, in full conformity with the resolution to which I have just referred, exorted the international community to abide by the decision of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, which has encouraged ongoing dialogue between the United Patriotic Forces which comprise all the anti-apartheid forces, on the one hand, and the De Klerk Government, on the other - in other words, CODESA II - and hopes that everything will be done by those States that have relations with that regime to exert real pressure in order to ensure the success of this process.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

My delegation, therefore, supports unreservedly the draft resolution presented by the ministerial delegation of the Organization of African Unity, since it condemns the escalation of violence in South Africa in all its forms and seeks to promote a peaceful transition to a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa. It also calls upon the Secretary-General of the United Nations to designate a special representative whose job it would be to create conditions conducive for a return to peace by eliminating violence and by resuming dialogue among all the parties concerned, which will be invited furthermore to cooperate with the special representative in order to remove all remaining obstacles to negotiation in CODESA II.

The Security Council is therefore dealing with a burning issue which should be the constant subject of its attention. The Council has already encouraged the organization of free and democratic elections throughout the world in recent years - for example, in Namibia, Nicaragua, Haiti and shortly in Cambodia as well as elsewhere. For that reason, the Security Council should take the same stance with respect to South Africa so that the results of these democratic elections can pave the way to a genuine democratic, non-racial and united South African Republic.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. ARRIA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to join in the congratulations that have been rightly extended to you, Sir, on your election to the presidency of the Council, and to Ambassador Noterdaeme of Belgium on the way in which he led the Council last month.

Clearly, the presence here of Ministers of Foreign Affairs from countries members of the Organization of African Unity lends special importance to this meeting of the Security Council.

The presence of Mr. Nelson Mandela, President of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), gives the meeting an added dimension. It is clear that he embodies the cause of an entire nation, a nation whose name can be summed up as "Mandela". That name also embodies the cause of mankind against apartheid, a crime against humanity unanimously condemned by this Organization. President Mandela's dignity, courage, tolerance and decency added unequalled weight and value to his address to the Council. For me and for my country, Nelson Mandela is a figure of his time, of our time, and of times to come.

Venezuela endorsed the request of the OAU summit to convene this meeting of the Security Council on the alarming situation in South Africa. It could not have been otherwise. My country is convinced that this forum of mankind, which has contributed so much to the struggle against apartheid, can still do a great deal more to end the violence and make it possible to resume negotiations.

Venezuela will support all measures the Council and the Secretary-General may consider proper to achieve the goals of ending the climate of violence and continuing the constitutional negotiations that are indispensable for the establishment of a new, non-racial, united and democratic South Africa.

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

We recognize the progress that has been made in South Africa, progress that gave rise to much hope in the international community. We therefore deeply regret that the negotiations and the progress have come to a halt. Controlable criminal violence has been responsible for this situation, which brings the Council together today.

In connection with the question of violence, I should like to quote a paragraph from the second report of the Goldstone Commission on the prevention of violence and intimidation in South Africa, issued yesterday in London:

> "The causes of the violence are many and complicated. They include economic, social and political imbalances against the people of South Africa. These are the consequences of three centuries of racial discrimination and over 40 years of extreme forms of racial and economic dislocations in consequence of the policy of apartheid. The consequences on the black people of South Africa are well known and documented."

There is no alternative to a resumption of negotiations, nor should there be. Violence would impose its unbridled pace and would take even more victims in a society which for centuries has been abandoned and martyred. That is why we are convinced that every effort must be made to reorient negotiations to reach a new constitutional agreement. We are also convinced that a climate of understanding and negotiation can be achieved only with an end to violence. South Africa must end this war with itself. That responsibility must be shouldered by all the parties.

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

Venezuela has always stood in solidarity with this cause of mankind, the struggle against apartheid, from the very moment when the then Prime Minister of India, Pandit Nehru, proposed the inclusion of this item on our agenda more than 40 years ago.

In 1989, from a Johannesburg prison cell, Nelson Mandela wrote a letter to the then President of South Africa, Mr. Botha, in which he said:

(spoke in English)

> "The move I have taken provides you with the opportunity to overcome the current deadlock and to normalize the country's political situation. I hope you will seize it without delay to lay the foundation for a new era in our country in which racial discrimination and prejudice, coercion and confrontation, death and destruction will be forgotten."

(spoke in Spanish)

That quotation summarizes a political position reflecting a will to negotiate, and this Council should not ignore it.

My country hopes that this opportunity will be created anew and that the parties will seize it to benefit a society that has been the victim of what the United Nations has termed a crime against humanity. In June 1990, Mr. Mandela himself stated the following here at the United Nations:

(spoke in English)

> "It will ever remain an accusation and a challenge to all men and women of conscience that it took as long as it has before all of us stood up to say enough is enough."

(spoke in Spanish)

Mankind, represented by this Council, cannot agree that

(spoke in English)

the book on apartheid has been closed.

(spoke in Spanish)

The international community remains committed to promoting a new, united, non-racial and democratic South African nation.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Venezuela for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. MERIMEE (France) (interpretation from French): It is with sadness and concern that my Government notes that the situation in South Africa has again necessitated a meeting of the Security Council. For several months we have been witness to an upsurge of violence in that country. Specifically, the French authorities have expressed their dismay at the 17 June massacres in Boipatong, which caused the death of many innocent victims.

These grave events have interrupted the process of national reconciliation that had been under way for more than two years, as well as the discussions taking place in the framework of the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA).

Yet much progress had been made. In 1990, Mr. Nelson Mandela, whom we welcome here today, was finally released. Between October 1990 and June 1991, the main legislative pillars of apartheid were eliminated. In September 1991, a national peace agreement was signed among the South African parties. In but

(Mr. Mérimée, France)

a few months, considerable steps had been taken thanks to the courage and determination of the central players, Mr. Nelson Mandela and President De Klerk.

France unreservedly supported the request made by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) for a meeting of the Security Council. In the past the Council has frequently had occasion to deal with South Africa. Then, it was a matter of combating the odious system of apartheid. Today the Council should send a dual message to the South Africans, calling upon them to put an end to the violence and to resume negotiations.

That has been the thrust of statements made by those who preceded me, particularly African representatives. In that connection, I welcome the Ministers who have honoured the Council by their presence today.

This appeal is also included in the draft resolution, which the Security Council will, I am sure, adopt by consensus. France fully supports this draft resolution, which condemns the escalation of violence, particularly the Boipatong massacre, calls for the resumption of peace negotiations and invites the Secretary-General to send a Special Representative to South Africa.

As we see it, this envoy will have the role of undertaking a dialogue with all the parties concerned and to help them in the search for ways and means of recreating a climate favourable to negotiation with a view to achieving a peaceful transition to a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa. It will be up to the representative appointed by the Secretary-General to determine, in agreement with all his partners in negotiation, the precise modalities of his mission.

The events in Boipatong remind us that the international community must continue to follow closely the situation in South Africa. Undoubtedly, an irreversible process has been initiated, but there is still a long way to go. France, which has firmly condemned the apartheid regime, believes that everything must be done to ensure that the parties successfully conclude their discussions in the framework of CODESA. That is why, together with its partners in the European Community, my Government has urged the South African Government to carry out immediately a thorough investigation of the Boipatong incidents. We have taken note of the South African Government's pledge to act in this way.

My delegation, finally, welcomes the fact that the draft resolution to be adopted by the Security Council will enable the United Nations to be involved in this process. Our Organization can indeed make a very useful contribution to the success of this effort at peace and reconciliation which all parties in South Africa have so successfully initiated.

Sir David HANNAY (United Kingdom): Not the least momentous of the fundamental changes reshaping the world in the last few years was the decision by the rulers of South Africa to turn away from the morally unacceptable and politically bankrupt dead end of apartheid and to seek a new future for their country through negotiations involving all its peoples. That process began with the release of Mr. Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, for which all our Governments had striven for so long. It continued through the progressive legislative dismantling of apartheid and it gathered momentum in this year's negotiations in the Convention for a Democratic South Africa. CODESA brought hope not only to the peoples of South Africa but to all those outside who had wanted to see a peaceful transition to a non-racial democracy. It also removed South Africa from the agenda of the Security Council, perhaps one of the most hopeful signs of all, because it meant that the problems and the future of South Africa were being addressed by South Africans themselves and not just through a process of coercion by the outside world.

Now South Africa is back on our agenda and that is no cause for rejoicing anywhere. It is there because the hopeful progress towards a new South Africa has faltered in the past few weeks. In the view of my Government, the objective of this debate and of the draft resolution we will adopt must be to help that progress to resume and to come to a negotiated conclusion. Everything this Council does or says must be tested against that criterion: does it help the process of negotiation to resume; does it help create an environment in South Africa propitious to an early and successful conclusion of those negotiations?

(Sir David Hannay,
United Kingdom)

The violence which has ruined the lives of so many South Africans is clearly a major factor cutting across and undermining the progress we wish to encourage. The responsibility for mastering it and for offering all South Africans security and protection is obviously a task for South Africans themselves, primarily for the Government and the police, but also for all those whose position in South African society gives them influence and authority. Together they have already taken the first steps towards a solution, by signing the National Peace Accord in September 1991, which provides a structure - on national, regional and local levels - for South Africans to confront violence and build confidence. The South African Government took another important step last year in appointing Judge Goldstone's Standing Commission of Enquiry into Violence and Intimidation. We applaud the work of this Commission, which enjoys the confidence of all South Africans. We hope the South African Government will find every possible way quickly to implement the Commission's recommendations and we look to all South Africans to cooperate in this.

The international community has long sought to promote change in South Africa by peaceful means. In addition to the consensus resolutions which we have adopted here at the last two sessions of the General Assembly, I would point to the encouragement given by the Commonwealth, and to the European Community's close interest in South Africa's progress. Most recently the European Community's Lisbon European Council meeting expressed its deep concern at the deaths at Boipatong, its hope that the significant achievements of CODESA would not be lost, and that the negotiations would therefore resume. As a further indication of the European Community's enduring concern, its Special Programme of Assistance to the Victims of Apartheid has grown to the

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

point where it is the Community's single largest aid programme in Africa, or anywhere else.

The South African Government is adopting a constructive approach to these various offers of external assistance. For the first time it has invited the participation of non-South Africans in its own internal investigations. Britain responded by providing the services of three police experts to assist Justice Goldstone's investigation of the Boipatong massacre. We hope that the international community will be ready to respond positively to any requests for further help that have the support of all the main parties. We would expect such help to be aimed at reinforcing the peace structures that South Africans themselves have already built.

As to the process of negotiation, in the view of my Government the sooner it can be resumed the better. A prolonged hiatus can be in no one's interest because the situation, both political and economic, is bound to deteriorate. There too, if there is any way the outside world can assist, we should do so, but we should seek to help, not to prescribe. In this spirit the troika of European Community Foreign Ministers will visit South Africa later this year to explore with all the parties ways to restore momentum to the negotiating process and to combat political violence.

My Government strongly supports the continuing use by the Secretary-General of his good offices, and we believe that the dispatch to South Africa of a Special Representative of high political standing is the best first step to take. The Special Representative's contacts with all parties in South Africa should enable the Secretary-General and the Security Council to discuss what useful and constructive role the United Nations could play in the period ahead. The Special Representative will need to work in the

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

closest cooperation with other organizations which, as I have said, are working for the same objectives - the Commonwealth, the Organization of African Unity, the European Community.

To conclude, it was right that the Security Council should have had this opportunity to hear directly from the parties involved about the violence which threatens to derail their search for peaceful political change. We wish to see that process of negotiation resume as soon as possible. It is the only way forward. A resumption of negotiations would itself help reduce tension and the risk of further violence.

Mr. BENJELLOUN-TOUIMI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): Permit me, firstly, to discharge the pleasant duty of conveying to you, Sir, on behalf of the delegation of the Kingdom of Morocco, our warmest congratulations on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council and for the skilful manner in which you are carrying out your important responsibility of guiding our work. I also convey congratulations to your predecessor, His Excellency the Permanent Representative of Belgium, Mr. Noterdaeme, under whose leadership the Council achieved significant results during the month of June.

We are all the more pleased to see you presiding over the work of the Council since you represent a sister country in Africa, Cape Verde, with which my country enjoys the closest relations and since the matter before us today is of crucial importance to our continent, Africa.

(Mr. Benjelloun-Touimi,
Morocco)

I should also like to praise the tireless efforts of Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, our Secretary-General, towards contributing to a just and equitable solution to this question, which concerns not only Africa but the world as a whole.

Our debate is taking place at a time when our hopes can still be realized - to see the emergence of an egalitarian, non-racist and multi-party democracy in South Africa. This hope has been nurtured in the last two years by the many initiatives taken with a view to dismantling the abhorrent system of apartheid. The release of Mr. Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, the lifting of the state of emergency, the return of exiles and the abrogation of laws that were pillars of apartheid were particularly important events. The international community has certainly played an important role in guiding the country in this way and has effectively contributed to promoting a dialogue with a view to establishing a fully representative government and to redressing the abuse and hardship that the South African majority has suffered for decades.

These positive developments, which reflect the wisdom and far-sightedness of South African political leaders, have led to the establishment since last December of constitutional talks and CODESA, whose work heralds the advent of a democratic, united and non-racial society in accordance with the relevant decisions of our Organization. There seems to be no turning back in this process. Negotiations in CODESA have reached an advanced stage, and the convergence of views on many of the key elements of a new constitution is cause for great hope.

The results of the referendum of 17 March last clearly show that an overwhelming majority of white South Africans support the negotiating process

(Mr. Benjelloun-Touimi, Morocco)

towards a non-racial democracy undertaken by President de Klerk. These results underscore that the South African people as a whole have remained committed to reforming the situation through peaceful means.

Events in South Africa over these last years are not all positive. Violence persists and continues to have destructive consequences for the social and ethnic fabric of the country. The continuation of acts of violence, which take a heavy toll on human lives, is a major obstacle to the process of putting an end to apartheid.

My country shares the deep concern over these acts of violence, which are increasing in the townships, and which are the heritage of a somber and forgotten past. The policy of domination and of racial segregation that existed for so long unfortunately led to an unstable social system, where the absence of communication and forced separation of ethnic groups precluded the development of a spirit of mutual understanding and became the obstacle to reconciliation.

While welcoming the progress that has been made in recent years, my country can only deplore the suspension of CODESA's work and the tragic events that led to this situation, which we hope will only be temporary.

Thus, we appeal to all South African parties to make reason prevail and to resume as soon as possible negotiations in CODESA with sincerity and good faith. We also appeal to them to refrain from any action that could further jeopardize the prospects for an equitable solution to their country's problem. There is no denying that that objective can be reached only through negotiation and conciliation. The international community and the Security Council must therefore contribute their firm support to the work of CODESA and

(Mr. Benjelloun-Touimi, Morocco)

use all available means to maintain the momentum and prevent the various extremist elements from derailing the process.

Morocco, which has always preferred dialogue and moderation, appeals to all parties and in particular to the South African Government on an urgent basis to put an end to violence, to guarantee law and order and security in their country, and to adopt all necessary measures. We encourage them to continue considering seriously and with neutrality the charges made against certain members of the security forces, who allegedly have encouraged violence. It is in fact the Government that is responsible for guaranteeing stability and lawfulness in a clear and impartial manner.

My country, which has always condemned apartheid as an institutionalized form of racial segregation and a systematic violation of the principle of equality of rights of all peoples, remains convinced that the vicious circle of violence and repression can be broken only through constructive dialogue, through negotiations in a climate of confidence and good faith.

We therefore hope that the Government as well as the opposition, aware of the absence of any realistic alternative to dialogue and negotiation, will prevail in their efforts to open the way to common approaches during the transition phase, as well as on the content of a new constitution for a democratic and non-racial Africa. In the last analysis, it is up to them to determine the type of society and government to which they aspire.

Under these circumstances, the Security Council is in duty bound to address to all South Africans a message of hope, to encourage them to have confidence in their common future and to strengthen their will to move towards the building of a new society based on freedom, dignity and equal rights for all.

(Mr. Benjelloun-Touimi, Morocco)

For its part, the Kingdom of Morocco remains hopeful that in the near future, a new democratic, united and non-racial South Africa will emerge, which will take its place in the concert of Nations.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Morocco for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. LI Daoyu (China) (interpretation from Chinese): At the outset, please allow me to welcome the Organization of African Unity (OAU) ministerial delegation; Mr. Nelson Mandela, President of the African National Congress (ANC); and Mr. Clarence Mlamli Makwetu, President of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), to today's formal meeting of the Security Council. The Chinese delegation would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to all the parties concerned, notably the OAU, for their positive contribution and their unremitting efforts towards finding a solution to the question of South Africa.

The outbreak of violence that rocked the Boipatong Township on 17 June 1992 not only resulted in the brutal killing of dozens of black people but also forced the suspension of the democratic negotiation process, which had only just begun. Like the rest of the international community, China is shocked and deeply concerned by the massacre.

We condemn these acts of violence, as well as any ploys or actions aimed at sabotaging the democratic process in South Africa. We hope that the South African Government will seriously consider the views and demands of the ANC and other parties concerned, take all necessary measures to put an immediate end to the violence and protect the lives of property of the black people of

(Mr. Li Daoyu, China)

South Africa, and break up the deadlock with actual deeds so as to create a propitious political atmosphere for an early resumption of the democratic negotiations.

The Chinese delegation endorses the reasonable propositions and recommendations of the OAU to resolve the current crisis in South Africa, and supports the good offices of the United Nations Secretary-General to bring an end to the violence and to facilitate the resumption of the democratic process in South Africa. China supports the adoption of a resolution by the Security Council in this regard.

It is no coincidence that the massacre at Boipatong took place so soon after the start of the democratic process in South Africa. This indicates clearly that smooth sailing is not to be expected in the political settlement of the South African question. The eradication of apartheid, the termination of white minority rule and the realization of genuine racial equality remain a formidable task.

(Mr. Li Daoyu, China)

Despite the abolition of the legal pillars of apartheid, the effect and influence of racial discrimination and the policy of apartheid on the political, economic, social and other spheres in South Africa are far from being eliminated. In our view, the restoration and maintenance of peace, security and stability are of crucial importance to the promotion and successful consummation of the democratic process in South Africa. We believe that the South African Government has the responsibility to take the necessary measures to eliminate completely all forms of racial discrimination and apartheid and to enable the black people in South Africa to enjoy fully equal treatment in the economic, social and educational fields as well as in medical care and housing, so as to create the necessary conditions to smooth the way for the democratic process in South Africa.

The Chinese Government and people have always firmly supported the South African people in their just struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination, and we support the efforts of all parties concerned to find a political solution to the South African question through democratic negotiations. We firmly believe that with the unremitting efforts of the South African people the goal of establishing a new South Africa characterized by unity, democracy and racial equality will surely be realized.

Mr. VORONTSOV (Russian Federation) (interpretation from Russian): The Russian delegation wishes first to welcome those Ministers for Foreign Affairs of African countries who are present at today's meeting of the Council, as well as the participants in the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA). We hope that their involvement in the Council's work will further the purpose for which we are met, which is to promote the overcoming of the political crisis that has arisen in South Africa, by bringing the parties involved in the settlement as part of the CODESA system back to the negotiating table, and also to promote cooperation and an end to violence and to prevent it in the future.

Our delegation, like others that have spoken at this meeting, is deeply concerned at the outbreak of violence in South Africa, which has cost human lives. It is perfectly clear that there can be no justification for violence. Not only does it lead to an individual's being deprived of his most basic right, the right to life, but it also creates obstacles to the negotiating process and thus threatens the vital interests of the entire population of South Africa.

At a time when South Africa is preparing vital reforms, all those involved in this extremely complex process of building a new, non-racial, democratic society - the Government of South Africa and those forces that are active in the political arena - must show particular restraint and take every step to exclude from the life of society violence as a means of achieving political ends. It is extremely important that there should not be passionate feelings and mutual recriminations, which now prevail, but, rather, a constructive approach and a readiness for compromise and political dialogue, to which, as we all realize, there is no reasonable alternative, because insisting on confrontation can only lead to chaos and a complete loss of control over a country's internal affairs.

The negotiating process in South Africa has already made considerable headway. Serious, constructive results have been achieved in the dismantling of apartheid. It is for precisely that reason that every effort should be made not to lose the momentum thus created and not to allow the recent difficulties to prevent the creation in South Africa of a non-racial, democratic State. In these circumstances, the Security Council is entitled to expect those forces involved in reforms in South Africa, as part of the CODESA process, to be aware of their historic responsibility for their country's fate. It is essential that the work of the negotiating mechanism be reinitiated immediately to establish a new constitutional order that will guarantee a general and equitable right of suffrage for all the people, without respect to race, and the full elimination of apartheid by political means and the creation of a non-racial, democratic society.

The delegation of the Russian Federation supports the draft resolution (S/24288) now before the Council. It is the result of a very serious effort. We hope that this balanced document, which was drawn up on the basis of a consensus appraisal of the situation, will help the parties involved to get out of the deadlock and will be an incentive for the parties in South Africa to resume the work of the Convention for a Democratic South Africa and create an atmosphere free of violence.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): It gives me great pleasure, Mr. President, to offer you my warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I have had the privilege of knowing you for a few years and of being personally acquainted with your very considerable diplomatic skills. We look forward to working under your continued leadership during the current month.

I should also like to convey my gratitude to your colleague, Ambassador Noterdaeme of Belgium, for the distinguished manner in which he presided over the Council during June.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

We are greatly honoured to have so distinguished a ministerial delegation from the Organization of African Unity (OAU) assisting us in the consideration of this very important question today. We are also honoured today by the presence of Mr. Nelson Mandela. Mr. Mandela, who has devoted his life to that noblest of ideals, the good of his country and the betterment of his fellow men, has come to symbolize for us the voice of all who struggle against injustice and tyranny. I also welcome Mr. Makwetu, President of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC). I also acknowledge the presence of the Secretary-General of the OAU, Dr. Salim Ahmed Salim.

We are meeting today at a critical juncture in the history of South Africa. Negotiations which started last year with the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) have been deadlocked. The abominable culture of violence is eating into the very fabric of South African society, threatening to extinguish the hope, which had been generated earlier, of the complete abolition of the abhorrent apartheid regime and a solution to the problem of South Africa, which, as the Permanent Representative of Venezuela reminded us, was first put on the United Nations agenda by India in 1946.

When the General Assembly considered the question of South Africa last year there was an atmosphere of optimism. The Secretary-General in his report had expressed the view:

> "Overall, the progress towards the end of apartheid in South Africa, although halting, remains on course. Major apartheid legal structures have been repealed; several measures necessary for a climate for negotiations, as well as peace initiatives, have been undertaken and South Africa appears to be moving ahead towards the beginning of substantive negotiations."

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

In 1991, the South African Government had abolished the Race Classification Laws, the racially based Land Measures Act, the Group Areas Act and the Land Acts. These actions had partially addressed the aspirations of the South African people. I say "partially" because these measures did not fully eliminate the detested apartheid structures; although indicating an element of political maturity on the part of the South African Government, they did not fully institute the process which could lead towards the establishment of a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa, as called for in the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa (General Assembly resolution S-16/1, annex) adopted by consensus by the General Assembly at its sixteenth special session on 14 December 1989.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

The process could only be expedited through negotiations in South Africa taking place in a climate free of all violence. Even at that time, it was fully realized that no fruitful negotiations could take place to meet the objectives of the majority of the South African people unless the question of violence was addressed effectively and expeditiously. It is tragic that the political violence has continued to raise its ugly head in South Africa from time to time and to stalemate whatever progress is achieved. The Indian delegation, at the debate in the General Assembly last year, specifically had drawn attention to this crucial issue, stating that violence posed serious danger to free political activity and the fragile process of change that was under way. Our delegation had stated:

> "It is vital that effective steps should be taken immediately to overcome that threat so as to ensure that anti-apartheid movements in South Africa are not deterred in their endeavours to bring about a peaceful transformation there."

The principles, as enunciated in the Declaration against apartheid, remain valid. The black majority of South Africa, as represented by liberation movements and other parties, must continue to engage in negotiations to achieve their political objectives. This goes without saying. Indeed, I would expect that the anti-apartheid movements themselves would be the most interested in resuming the negotiating process. But it is equally clear that negotiations can only be conducted in an atmosphere free of violence. When the process of the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) started last year, with the first meeting of CODESA on 20 and 21 December, it was expected that the world would soon see an end to the last

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

vestiges of apartheid in South Africa. Almost all the liberation movements of South Africa, the South African Government and the other involved parties participated in the process, thus giving it a near universal character in the context of the South African political field. We all know the considerable progress achieved in the CODESA process, and the reasons for its breakdown. I will, therefore, not go into them.

It was my privilege to lead, on behalf of the Secretary-General and the Member States, the United Nations Observer Delegation to CODESA II on 16 and 17 May, where I had the opportunity to meet with various cross-sections of political and public opinion. It was regrettable that CODESA II did not lead to the desired and even expected success.

At a time when further efforts were being made by the African National Congress (ANC) and other parties to CODESA to find ways to overcome the deadlock, it was tragic that the black-on-black violence in South Africa came back with renewed ferocity, as if to challenge the hopes and aspirations of all segments of the South African population as well as of the entire international community. The Boipatong massacre needs to be strongly condemned by the world not only because the incidents were a macabre crime against humanity but also because they gave a severe jolt to the process of negotiation. The incident clearly demonstrated the importance of finding an urgent solution to the problem of violence if the process of negotiation is to be carried to its desired end. The international community must demand a full, impartial investigation into the incidents and place responsibility for them on the shoulders of those who actually aided, either covertly or overtly, in the perpetration of this heinous crime.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

My Prime Minister, Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao, once said:

> "Apartheid is an abomination which must be totally erased because it is an insult to humanity. Human dignity and the well-being of the individual can be guaranteed only under conditions of full enjoyment of fundamental rights and freedoms, irrespective of colour, creed, class or birth."

It bears repetition that the objective of all of us, in the Council and elsewhere, is to see the emergence of a non-racial, democratic government in South Africa. This can be achieved only if the negotiations accord due weight to the wishes of the majority of the South African people and if the new Constitution establishes a system in which decisions are taken in a fully democratic manner.

The international community must continue to exert influence and exercise vigilance until such time as all the people of South Africa are able to live together as fully equal citizens in a truly non-racial, democratic society within the framework of a Constitution, freely agreed upon by the people on a non-discriminatory basis.

The draft resolution contained in document S/24288 reflects these principles which could guide the process towards achieving the objective of a democratic system of governance in South Africa. My delegation hopes that the unanimous adoption of this draft resolution will help in effectively putting an end to the violence in South Africa. This is the central issue affecting the resumption of the process of negotiation. Indeed, this is also the issue which the proposed resolution seeks to address. We trust that the Special Representative of the Secretary-General will be able to visit South Africa as early as possible to look into the phenomenon of recurring violence and recommend measures which would put an end to the violence as well as create conditions conducive to resumption of negotiations towards achieving the desired objective of establishing a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa. My delegation will look forward to the report of the Secretary-General and his recommendations.

Mr. PERKINS (United States of America): My congratulations to you, Sir, on continuing your presidency during a very dynamic month and once again I should like to extend my praise and congratulations to our colleague from Belgium for the work he did last month.

The United States has watched with admiration the impressive efforts over the past year of all parties in South Africa to bring an end to apartheid and to negotiate a new constitution that has as its goal a democratic, non-racial government for all the people of South Africa. We salute the black majority in South Africa for the skill and patience with which they and their leaders have persevered on this matter; we commend the authorities in South Africa for actions taken to abolish institutionalized apartheid; and we laud all the parties who have entered into negotiations about the country's future, creating what I hope will be an irreversible process which will lead to the establishment of a democratic, non-racial government. Of that I am certain. It is the policy of my Government to do all it can to further the negotiating process, and I believe that that must also be the goal of the Security Council.

We welcome the present Security Council debate on the future of South Africa and thank the Organization of African Unity (OAU) for helping recently at its annual summit meeting to focus world attention on this very important matter. The presence here today of so many distinguished representatives from

(Mr. Perkins, United States)

the OAU, other African nations, opposition movements within South Africa, and from the Government of South Africa, gives us a unique opportunity to reach consensus on what must be done to suggest means of bringing all South African parties together to continue their negotiations.

Momentous change bears inevitable costs, but the violence that has wracked South Africa is too great a price and must be brought under control. The world is watching, as is history. The leaders participating in the current transition in South Africa bring to the process impressive skill, experience and, in many cases, the wisdom brought by suffering. At this critical point, statesmanship is another necessary ingredient.

Our purpose in being here today is to take those steps which increase the ability of South Africans to overcome the violence and get on with the important task of negotiations. We have full confidence in the Commission chaired by Justice Richard Goldstone to investigate the violence, and we support the fullest implementation of the Commission's findings by all parties. We also support the efforts of the National Peace Accord Forum. The United Nations stands ready to help these efforts, but they will only bear fruit if the parties themselves resolve to control the violence.

We believe it is impossible for us to ascertain precisely what is necessary to get all the leaders of South Africa back to the negotiating table in an atmosphere free of violence. A small United Nations team dispatched to South Africa, however, would be able to gain a better perspective. In that regard, my Government supports a draft resolution which we hope will result from these talks and these hearings today and possibly tomorrow. We certainly propose that a United Nations goodwill mission, under the Secretary-General's good offices, travel to South Africa to meet with all leaders and to offer its services to bring the parties closer together. A goodwill team would seek to enhance the complex negotiations but would not seek to supplant that process. The issue of violence is one of a series of issues that must be examined to get to where we want to be: creating the conditions to get negotiations restarted.

In summary, let me restate my Government's position. The United Nations should help create the conditions for progress. A good start has already been made by the Organization of African Unity in helping to get all parties together here today. With good will, a measure of statesmanship and an eye to history, we can do much more. We must not delay, as time is short, and South Africa has waited far too long.

The PRESIDENT: I now welcome the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zimbabwe, His Excellency Dr. Nathan Shamuyarira, and invite him to make his statement.

Mr. SHAMUYARIRA (Zimbabwe): Mr. President, let me say at the outset how pleased Zimbabwe is to have you presiding over our deliberations today. We have full confidence that you will steer our discussions towards a conclusion that will yield results for the suffering people of South Africa

(Mr. Shamuyarira, Zimbabwe)

and for the entire African continent. Also, I should like to offer our congratulations to the representative of Belgium for the effective leadership he provided to the Council last month, and to thank all the members of this Council generally for acceding to the request of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) for an urgent meeting to consider the distressing situation unfolding in South Africa.

I believe that my colleague the Foreign Minister of Senegal has already outlined the framework in which the Organization of African Unity (OAU) has brought this matter before the Council. The purpose for which this meeting was requested by the African Heads of State is clearly spelt out in their resolution adopted in Dakar, Senegal, three weeks ago, which has now been circulated as an official document of the Council.

First, the Council should examine the issue of violence in South Africa and take all appropriate action to ensure that the violence is brought to an end. One is very pleased that all the statements that have been made this afternoon agree totally on this point. It is very important that violence be stopped in order for negotiations to continue.

Secondly, the Council should assist the South African people in the creation of conditions for negotiations leading towards a peaceful transition to a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa.

Thirdly, the Secretary-General should be invited to put into place a mechanism for the continuous monitoring of the evolution of the South African situation.

Thus, in calling for this meeting, our Heads of State had very clear objectives, the three objectives I have just stated. The OAU, through its Ad Hoc Committee on Southern Africa; the Commonwealth in its deliberations in

(Mr. Shamuyarira, Zimbabwe)

Kuala Lumpur and later in Harare; and the entire membership of the United Nations through its consensus Declaration on Apartheid and Its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa, adopted in December 1989 - all joined their voices in encouraging the people of South Africa to come together to negotiate an end to apartheid and to create an atmosphere in which there could be meaningful negotiations. The subsequent convening of the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) was in keeping with these calls from the OAU, from the Commonwealth and from the United Nations. Thus we all welcomed and supported the peace process which had started in South Africa.

There have been a number of statements made by representatives today that there is no other way to make progress except through negotiations and, to be more precise, through CODESA. Here I would only sound a word of warning, which we have been sounding on many other occasions, that is, not to take at face value what the South African says without putting it squarely against the practice and the achievements of that regime. All the statements made in the last two years have been very good and forward looking, but in actual practice very little has been achieved either to democratize the system or to ensure the enjoyment of full human rights by the majority of the people.

In these circumstances, just to call for a resumption of CODESA is not enough. What is the basis on which CODESA can and would be recalled? What will it discuss? What is the goal? If the goal is a non-racial and democratic South Africa, then we have to be satisfied that the Government, which is the main player in the CODESA process, is sincere and committed to the creation of non-racialism and democracy. We have been told here by Mr. Mandela, the President of the ANC - and he told us the same thing in Dakar three weeks ago; and Clarence Makwetu, President of the Pan Africanist

(Mr. Shamuyarira, Zimbabwe)

Congress of Azania (PAC), also told us the same thing - that in their view the Government was not committed to a democratic South Africa. That is what brought CODESA II to a halt. The Government worked out a mathematical formula, percentage votes and what-have-you, all of which were intended to give the white minority a veto and to abort the whole process towards democracy. That is what has annoyed Nelson Mandela and that is what has annoyed Clarence Makwetu and other leaders of democratic organizations within South Africa. We should address that question fully before just calling for a resumption of the CODESA meetings. It would be a resumption to discuss what?

The tragic massacre at Boipatong and other recent similar incidents are merely the tip of the iceberg. The violence in South Africa has become endemic. There are manifestations of a deeper and a larger problem of an ongoing and ugly nature - an ongoing campaign of violence that has assumed particular patterns in the last few years in South Africa. More than 7,000 people have been killed in South Africa in the last four years. Last week we were told by a South African organization through the press that as many as 1,800 people have been killed this year alone. And in June, last month, as many as 380 deaths occurred. The toll of the carnage is just too much, and we have to do something to stop it. As I have said, one is very pleased that all the delegations around this table are totally agreed on this point.

(Mr. Shamuyarira, Zimbabwe)

Some statements have been made about the Goldstone Commission. Some Heads of Delegation have urged us to support the recommendations of the Goldstone Commission, which I am told were published in London yesterday. I was travelling from Africa yesterday, and I have not read the report. The Goldstone Commission was appointed by the South African Government, but owing to international pressure it was recently broadened in order to take on an international character. My delegation would have preferred a commission appointed by this body or by another body of the United Nations, or failing that by the Commonwealth - which sent a very important mission to South Africa in 1986 which gave us very valuable information - with the support and encouragement of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). In that way we would be certain of both impartiality and of continuing to monitor South Africa and get valuable information from that country.

I would have thought it was not enough just to internationalize a South African commission. I am not opposing what has been suggested by other speakers around this table, but I have not seen the Goldstone Commission report; I have not seen what it says. Naturally, therefore, I cannot commit my delegation or my Government to it. But I would say that in principle it would have been better had the commission come from here rather than from the South African Government.

Nothing has stopped the South African Government in the past several years from appointing an international commission; I do not know why they are hurrying now, unless it is because they see that the international community is about to appoint such a commission. Those are matters we should look at.

(Mr. Shamuyarira, Zimbabwe)

We are told that there is black-on-black violence; this has been referred to by a number of speakers. In my experience, you do get fights between political activists in a political party and so forth, but inter-party clashes such as we have had in Zimbabwe and in many other countries do not result in deaths and do not result in the scale of violence we have seen in South Africa, where people with machine-guns go into trains and mow down hundreds of people going to work, or where people from squatter compounds or camps go to other townships and kill 30 or 50 people, as happened at Boipatong. That is clearly a level that shows organization and that requires people who have the weaponry and the means to use it. This matter needs to be looked at very closely now. In my view, the Goldstone Commission is not the right commission to give us definitive information about this. If there is so-called black-on-black violence, then let us have an investigation; let us have it confirmed by an impartial body. That is what an impartial body would do.

I was pleased to learn yesterday that the South African President, Mr. De Klerk, announced that he was going to disband certain armed units such as Koevoet, which is an armed unit of recruits that operated in Namibia before independence but have now gone back to South Africa, and Battalion 32, which is an armed battalion that consists of recruits from Angola who went back to South Africa after the end of the war in Angola. These groups - including Selous Scouts from Zimbabwe and PIDE agents from Mozambique - have been regrouping in South Africa and have been used as undercover agents for various activities that are all well known to us. We documented those activities at the time the South African Government was pursuing a destabilization policy

(Mr. Shamuyarira, Zimbabwe)

against all its neighbours. We are glad to say that this has now come to an end to a large extent. But those units are still there, and we hear that an element of the armed Koevoet unit was the one used in the Boipatong matter. But I am glad that the President of South Africa has announced the disbanding of these units; this will be a major step forward in achieving the peace we need in order for the negotiations to continue.

Besides the issue of violence, another factor that has contributed to the crisis facing the process of negotiations in South Africa is the fundamental issue of the National Party - the ruling party of South Africa - not accepting the principle of majority rule. This is an issue that lies at the very heart of the whole process of transforming South Africa into a non-racial, democratic and united country.

The international community cannot avoid addressing this matter if it is sincerely committed to helping the people of South Africa out of the crisis they are now facing. The fundamental issue is the non-acceptance by the National Party of majority rule as we know it, and that means democracy as we know it today. That is what brought the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) to a halt. The attempt to entrench the rights of minorities in the constitution is acceptable; we all have such entrenchment of rights, and we would like minorities - whether tribal, or racial, or whatever - to be protected in their own societies. Majority rule does not and should never mean riding rough-shod over the rights of minorities. It means protecting minorities as well as the majority.

(Mr. Shamuyarira, Zimbabwe)

But what is not acceptable is giving a minority the right to veto legislation or decisions that have to be taken. That, we are told by the South Africans - by the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) and other organizations there - is the problem: that the National Party wants a veto for the minority in the constitution and in the process. Whether you put the veto at 75 per cent, at 70 per cent or even at 51 per cent, the point is that building into a system a veto for a minority would not be democratic. That is an issue that should also be faced.

Related to this is the imperative need for this Council to urge the negotiating parties to accelerate the process once the negotiations are back on track. We entirely agree; we would like the negotiations to get back on track, but on a basis acceptable to the negotiating parties; on a basis that clearly leads to non-racialism and democracy within South Africa; and on a basis that will get rid of violence, that will get rid of intimidation, that will get rid of all obstacles to the process. We were very pleased when the South African parties were talking about removing those impediments, or "levelling the playing field" as they say. We thought the playing field was being levelled. But when there is built-in violence and a built-in veto for minorities, then the playing field is not level; it is very bumpy in fact.

CODESA was plunged into the current crisis by the ongoing violence, and when the negotiations start up again we would like them to make rapid progress. Making rapid progress means defining the goals and the framework within which the discussions should take place. We hope that the South African leaders and their organizations will move rapidly in that direction.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zimbabwe for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. ERDOS (Hungary) (interpretation from French): Hungary has been following with profound concern the recent escalation of violence in South Africa. We strongly deplore and condemn the massacre which took place at Boipatong. We gave our support to the request of the Organization of African Unity to convene in this connection an urgent meeting.

The wave of violence that has struck South Africa poses a grave threat to the future of the negotiation process, a process which has already led to unquestionably valuable results and which, moreover, holds great hope for the future. The purpose of the negotiation process is to set up a constitution designed to secure the complete and peaceful elimination of apartheid, a system which is totally contrary to the values of our civilization, and to build a non-racial, democratic and united South Africa. In order to achieve this goal, it is essential for the signatories of the National Peace Accord to return to the negotiating table.

The dramatic changes which have occurred recently in the eastern-central region of Europe, including Hungary, bear some similarity to those now taking shape in South Africa. The most critical challenge that those changes posed for our region was that of ensuring that the transition towards democracy would take place peacefully. The experience my country has gained in this matter suggests that changes of system carried out in our region were helped

(Mr. Erdos, Hungary)

enormously by the absence of violence. Those changes of system succeeded in becoming substantial and convincing in nature, to the extent that power was transferred exclusively by peaceful means, through negotiation mechanisms, by means of agreements concluded between political partners of opposing camps. That experience has also shown that one must avoid doing anything that might serve to unleash passions and to set in motion uncontrollable processes, thus jeopardizing the success of the transition itself.

We believe that the fundamental objective of the community of nations must be to encourage the resumption of the negotiation process and to help restore conditions for peace within South African society. We urge the South African Government and all other parties concerned to halt the violence, to calm people's minds and to find those to blame for the atrocities that have been perpetrated and to uphold the rule of law. In the critical situation prevailing today, which is full of bitterness but also of hope, the Security Council must avoid deterring any participant in CODESA from the idea of resuming negotiations. Similarly, the mission that the Secretary-General of the United Nations is asked to send to South Africa must promote the halting of violence and the continuation of negotiations as soon as possible, in consultation with all parties concerned.

We are convinced that if the United Nations wants to play a helpful part, with the specific means available to it, in efforts designed to form a truly democratic and non-racial South African Government, the only real alternative open to us is the resumption of negotiations within the framework of CODESA, for without it those efforts may well fail, with tragic consequences. The draft resolution before us, which is the result of painstaking consultations, can make a valuable contribution to the establishment of a climate favourable

(Mr. Erdos, Hungary)

to the ultimate objective of democracy, non-discrimination and well-being for each and every one of the citizens of South Africa.

Mr. AYALA LASSO (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): At the outset, I wish to hail the representation of the Organization of African Unity here by illustrious Ministers for Foreign Relations. Ecuador is likewise greatly pleased with the presence among us of Mr. Nelson Mandela, a powerful symbol of triumph and hope.

This evening we have heard eloquent speeches condemning apartheid, which is the root of the violence in South Africa and which has prompted this urgent meeting of the Security Council.

Few issues draw so much attention from the international community. Few issues have required so much of the attention of the United Nations. This is because apartheid is the most damnable offence against the principle of equality among all human beings and the most damnable denial of human dignity. For these reasons, the Organization has made it clear on numerous occasions that apartheid, as a crime against humanity, is not responsive to reform. Apartheid must simply disappear in its entirety. For these same reasons, the movement of the non-aligned countries has always lent its most determined support to the aspirations of the noble peoples of Africa.

We must acknowledge that the Government of South Africa has recently carried out important positive changes in its policies in this regard. Nevertheless, the continued existence of apartheid has turned into a trap that makes it difficult for the process to come to real fruition.

The most damnable expression of violence that is committed against mankind is apartheid. The use of violence, regrettably, generates more

(Mr. Ayala Lasso, Ecuador)

violence. The tragic events that recently took place in Boipatong and the lamentable consequences of that institutionalized violation of human dignity call for our most vigorous condemnation.

In a regime of racial discrimination, violence, historically, is manifested in two ways: the continuing violence of the suppression of rights that every human being is entitled to and the recurring, localized violence of repression.

With his characteristic eloquence, Mr. Mandela has reminded us today that every government that conscientiously exercises power has the inherent and inescapable obligation to maintain public order and civil peace and to bring to justice and punish those who are responsible for violence.

Thus, the pacification of South Africa and the creation of an atmosphere of coexistence that makes possible the negotiation between all the components of South African society is the prime responsibility of the Government of that country.

Ecuador welcomed the negotiation process begun in the framework of CODESA and considers that it is essential to contribute collectively to the creation of the necessary conditions for those negotiations to resume. In this regard there is a collective responsibility, but it falls primarily to the Government that holds power to undertake, sincerely and effectively, the elimination of violence and the obstacles that impede the progress of the negotiations.

The United Nations must take measures to respond appropriately to the requirements of peace, equality and justice in South Africa within the framework of its competence. For that reason, Ecuador believes that the appointment of a Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General, with a mandate to do everything he or she deems necessary to investigate the causes of violence and foster the necessary conditions for resuming the negotiating process, represents a timely measure.

The recommendations formulated by the Special Representative will make it possible for the Security Council once again to discuss the item before us and take appropriate measures.

Ecuador considers it very important to reactivate the CODESA negotiating process. We are convinced that the only lasting solution to problems between peoples and human groups is to be sought by means of peaceful negotiation.

Accordingly, Ecuador calls upon all to contribute to restoring in South Africa the climate necessary for CODESA negotiations to progress. Peace cannot become a hostage to violent provocations. We want for South Africa a peace based on respect for human rights, equality and justice. That is the only way we will see the birth of a democratic, non-racial country, united under the flag of human dignity for all people.

Mr. HATANO (Japan): Japan wishes to express its deep concern over the recent violence in South Africa, particularly in Boipatong, which took a heavy toll in innocent human life and has disrupted efforts toward achieving a non-racial democracy representative of all South Africans.

Regrettably, the political will to press ahead with the negotiating process within the framework of CODESA appears to have severely weakened. If

(Mr. Hatano, Japan)

the situation is allowed to deteriorate further and the negotiating process is not revived, all segments of South Africa's population will lose. A deeper crisis benefits no one.

Although the Government of South Africa claims that it was not directly or indirectly involved in this violence, the South African authorities have the responsibility of immediately taking all necessary measures to bring an end to the violence and to guarantee public safety. A full investigation into the Boipatong incident must be carried out, and those found responsible duly punished. The Government of South Africa and other concerned parties can work together to ensure that justice is done and peace restored.

The United Nations will render a useful contribution to this process by dispatching a Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

Further, Japan calls on the leaders of all parties concerned to renew their commitment to achieving a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa through peaceful negotiations.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker inscribed on my list is Mr. Clarence Makwetu, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MAKWETU: On behalf of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) and the majority of the oppressed, exploited and dispossessed people of Azania it represents, we wish to thank the Organization of African Unity and the African Group at the United Nations, whose swift and efficient administration made this urgently convened special meeting of the Security Council possible.

(Mr. Makwetu)

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the Presidency of this very important organ, the United Nations Security Council. I have no doubt that your long experience and tested diplomatic skills, coupled with your incisive and analytical mind, will see us beyond the murky waters in which we are wading.

Allow me also, Sir, to commend your predecessor, Ambassador Noterdaeme, for the successful manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Security Council during the month of June.

This is the first time in four years that a proposal of this sort is before the Council, since the unanimous resolution and decisions affecting the Sharpeville Six. I wish to thank profusely the members of the Security Council and all the other United Nations leaders and individuals who heeded the call to save our lives. We are hopeful and confident that as in the case of the Sharpeville Six, the decisions that you arrive at in these meetings will, this time as well, save many more lives in our blood-drenched country.

The euphoria created by the seemingly wonderful reformist posturing of Mr. F.W. de Klerk has made way for sobering concerns and serious questions by the international community regarding his real motives. The euphoria was created by the unbanning of the PAC and other organizations and the repeal of certain laws. Mr. de Klerk was judged at face value and applauded. He received the red-carpet treatment wherever he went.

My submission is that, from the beginning, Mr. de Klerk never had a change of heart. He was forced against his will to adopt a reformist posture by the twin pressures of heightened internal resistance and the international isolation campaign, which included punitive economic sanctions. In short, the

(Mr. Makwetu)

reforms came not as the result of democratic good will, but because the regime had to embark on them to get itself out of isolation.

This special meeting of the Security Council is necessary because, contrary to the belief of some governments, relaxing these pressures has not helped the suffering, oppressed masses, but instead played into the hands of this murderous regime.

Mr. de Klerk simultaneously announced reforms and unleashed an unprecedented wave of violence: 7,000 people have died since 2 February 1990. According to a news conference held by Major General L.C.A. Pruis on 9 June 1992, the South African security forces expect the violence to escalate over the next six months.

(Mr. Makwetu)

There is genocide of the African people in our country. The Boipatong massacre of over 51 unarmed women, children and men on 17 June 1992 is not an isolated incident; it is only the tip of the iceberg. In that massacre a nine-month-old baby, Aron Mathope, and an 85-year-old grandmother, Mrs. Elizabeth Ndamase, were shot at close range and brutally stabbed to death. The perpetrators of this crime were transported in vehicles of the South African regime.

In South Africa, Africans - the victims of apartheid and colonialism - are the only people who frequent graveyards with monotonous regularity. There have been many massacres before and after Boipatong. They coexisted with the so-called Convention for a Democratic South Africa. Our people have been subjected too long to the peace of the grave. The PAC, as their representative, can no longer take this genocide.

According to the controlled media, over 12,000 people have been killed since September 1984, over 7,000 of them since De Klerk assumed the leadership of our country. Since 1990, Africans have continued to die at a daily average of eight people. In 1990 alone, therefore, on that average, 2,920 people died.

At this rate, without sounding cynical, it is fair to say that by the year 2000, eight years from now, we shall have lost a total of more than 23,000 African men, women and children, killed in an undeclared war by the South African regime.

My people are being killed on a daily basis in significant numbers. I want to stress one point: the Boipatong incident is but one in a daily catalogue of murders for political reasons perpetrated by the racist regime.

The refusal to disband the special forces and insistence on using mercenary forces, such as former members of the Koevoet, Buffalo Battalion 32,

(Mr. Makwetu)

Askaris, Selous Scouts and the Black Cat gang and the continuation of covert operations only reinforce public suspicion.

The statement made last night by the De Klerk regime that it was disbanding Buffalo Battallion 32 and Koevoet, and that these would be integrated into the existing police force, is another ploy by the regime to mislead world opinion, and this gathering in particular, into believing that it has yielded to our demand. That is not the case. These mercenary forces will remain part of the security forces of the regime, and such integration falls short of our legitimate demand for the immediate and verifiable expulsion of these mercenary forces.

Commenting on the police deployment of ex-Koevoet fighters, Judge Goldstone said that whether or not they were involved in violence their "infamous reputation" could only cause further distrust and suspicion of the security forces. In assessing the regime's record, the following facts must be taken into account. Not a single person has been convicted in connection with 49 massacres which have occurred over the past two years in Transvaal. Ironically, the Trust Feeds massacre of December 1980 stands out as the major instance where convictions have been secured. Those convicted were policemen.

Up to now no move has been made to suspend the head of the South African Police forensic laboratories, General Lothar Neethling, after a Supreme Court civil-case finding in January last year that his involvement in the poisoning of activists was, on the balance of probabilities, true. Despite the Harms Commission finding implicating several CCB members in political violence, none has been charged. At least 20 CCB members, and probably many more, remain on the South African Army payroll.

(Mr. Makwetu)

In an official operation in 1986 the South African Army gave military training in Namibia to 200 Inkatha men, who were later absorbed into the Kwa-Zulu Police. In sworn affidavits several of the trainees claimed to have been trained in offensive warfare. Some of the trainees have subsequently been implicated in the Natal violence.

A Weekly Mail investigation this year revealed the use of extra-legal methods, including systematic use of false vehicle registration plates, some belonging to bona fide individuals and companies, to cover a police operation in the Vaal.

The vigorous attempt to reduce the African population numerically takes place against the background of massive recruitment of white immigrants, especially from Eastern European countries. This white immigration is intended to increase the white population in South Africa. The recruitment of whites by the South African racist colonialist regime must be stopped until there is a new Constitution drawn up by a democratically elected Constituent Assembly dismantling apartheid in accordance with the United Nations Declaration of 14 December 1989.

Security Council resolution 554 (1984) of 17 August 1984 declared the 1983 apartheid constitution, which is still operating to this minute, "null and void". Immigrants who acquire citizenship under that constitution are illegal and their citizenship cannot be legally valid. The PAC therefore requests the Security Council to adopt a resolution demanding the South African regime to stop forthwith the recruitment of immigrants until there is profound and irreversible change in South Africa and a democratically elected Government is in place.

(Mr. Makwetu)

The Pan Africanist Congress of Azania is the architect of the call for international involvement to resolve the crisis in Azania. The regime continues to oppose meaningful and effective international involvement on the grounds that international involvement will be interfering in the affairs of a sovereign State or alternatively will undermine the sovereignty of the State. It bases its sovereignty on the de facto relationships with various countries flowing from certain international obligations.

The naked truth, however, is that the indigenous African people of Azania were colonized and have not regained their land and national sovereignty as at the date of this meeting. So-called claims of sovereign statehood under these circumstances are feeble attempts to mutilate and fake the history of our country and to manipulate international law in the most scandalous and gigantic colonial fraud of the twentieth century. The only time Azania will be an independent and sovereign State is when the vast dispossessed, indigenous African majority, whose country was colonized, regain control of their inalienable right to self-determination.

Azania, after many wars of national resistance against colonialism, became four separate British colonies - Natal, Cape, Transvaal and Orange River Colony - until the British Statute of 20 September 1909 called the South Africa Act. One of the reasons the four colonies were united as South Africa was to fight what the colonialists called "native danger" - that is, the indigenous African majority.

The South African problem is therefore an international problem. It involves colonialism and apartheid. Colonialism is a violation of international law. For apartheid there is the 1973 International Convention on the Supression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. Apartheid is a crime against humanity. Moreover, as already stated, there is genocide in

(Mr. Makwetu)

South Africa. This crime is forbidden by the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

The recent referendum showed clearly that South Africa is still racist, that only 5 per cent of the population is still regarded as human beings. Africans are still voteless and landless. Despite so-called repeals, 87.3 per cent of our land is in the hands of whites. Worse still, even land that was promised to us as early as 1936 is still in the hands of whites.

(Mr. Makwetu)

Therefore, it is arrogance of the first order to say that apartheid is dead. Less than 5 per cent of the total capital assets are owned by Africans. 5 to 7 million Africans live below the bread line. Fifty per cent of African babies die before they reach the age of five. Therefore, the legitimacy of our struggle to transform the status quo can only be equalled by the illegitimacy of the present regime to continue ruling.

The PAC and the dispossessed African masses hereby formally extend an invitation to the United Nations to send an international commission to South Africa to investigate and recommend measures which could bring an effective end to the violence, for the following reasons:

The violence is ongoing, inhuman, disruptive and escalating with no end in sight. I quoted earlier a statement made only a few days ago by the security force spokesman in which he said that they predict an escalation of the violence. They do not predict any curbing of the violence through their efforts.

Beside the fact that the foreign faces in the Goldstone Commission represent an acknowledgement of the need for international involvement, their recruitment into failed and failing strategies leaves much to be desired. I have no choice but to call on the Security Council to condemn the South African regime for its involvement in the violence. Culpability extends to acts of commission and omission.

Through its numerous resolutions and declarations in support of our liberation struggle and movements, the United Nations is seized of the matter of our freedom and, owing to the inhuman acts perpetrated against us, this is the most appropriate forum to assist in resolving the problem of violence to destabilize the United Nations recognized movements and to reduce the African population numerically.

(Mr. Makwetu)

As I speak now, the problem is already internationalized through the involvement of foreign mercenary forces, like Buffalo Batallion 32, the Koevoet, and so forth. I call on all persons present here today to ask themselves why any Government would want to keep batallions of foreign mercenaries and spend no less than R5 billion for covert operations when it is not facing any foreign threat from outside and its masses inside are ready to address the political problems democratically through the election of a constituent assembly.

Foreign mercenaries, as I have already indicated, internationalize the problem. The Security Council must internationalize the solution. The United Nations should supervise the disbanding and expulsion of foreign mercenaries and investigate the true nature of the violence with a view to identifying the perpetrators and, together with the Azanians, work out solutions which will work. The PAC is ready to collaborate fully with such a commission on the violence.

The lifting of sanctions against the South African regime by sections of the international community was premature. Selective and voluntary sanctions should be strengthened and a moratorium on sports contacts should be introduced until peace and democracy have been achieved through the electoral process. The ongoing violence makes it impossible for the oppressed to prepare themselves properly for the sporting events in many parts of our country. Since the violence is political, its solution should have a political content. To this end, this meeting should empower the Secretary-General to identify a neutral venue and representatives of the United Nations urgently to convene, chair, verify, supervise and mediate the discussions on and the election of a constituent assembly.

(Mr. Makwetu)

The immediate task of the broad liberation movement in the current phase of struggle is the transfer of political power to a non-racial democratic majority.

The only legitimate and democratic forum for such transfer of power and the creation of a new constitution is a constituent assembly elected on the basis of one-person, one-vote, on a common voter's role in a unitary State. The present regime cannot be, and is not the agent of democratic change; the masses of our people are.

Our stand on CODESA is well-known. At its inception we contended, as we still do, that CODESA is unrepresentative and undemocratic. Save for the ANC and the SACP, the forum is prepacked with government-created puppets with no support on the ground; it lacks neutrality, as there is no neutral convener, chairperson and mediators; it lacks transparency, inasmuch as media attendance of its proceedings and other forms of reporting are absent.

In the wake of the failure of CODESA, the PAC has been vindicated in its assertion that CODESA is a kaleidoscope of political intrigue. It has now become abundantly clear that the minority regime has not been negotiating in good faith to create a genuine democracy and thus is not prepared to relinquish power. A double agenda has come to the fore which entails, on the one hand, the strengthening of its ruling power base, and on the other, weakening the overall position of the liberation movement.

Consequently, the PAC reiterates the following: democratic elections for a constituent assembly to draw up a new constitution must be held without delay; the regime must beforehand concede that the only legitimate and democratic forum for transfer of power and the creation of a new constitution is a constituent assembly elected on the basis of one-person, one-vote, on a

(Mr. Makwetu)

common voter's role; a new restructured forum, free from the defects of CODESA, should be convened in order to facilitate negotiations in good faith and with the primary purpose of transferring power to a democratic majority.

In conclusion, may I take this opportunity to thank members of the Council, as representatives of humanity, for setting aside time to share our grief, and to attempt to find a solution with us.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Makwetu for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria, His Excellency Major-General Ike Nwachukwu. I welcome His Excellency and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. NWACHUKWU (Nigeria): Having had the opportunity to listen carefully to earlier speakers, my country has the honour to add its voice to those of other countries representing the continent of Africa before this distinguished Council to address the ongoing tragic violence in South Africa.

Today's Council meeting is propitious. As the principal organ of the world body charged with the responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, the Council, we believe, has a duty to assess the situation in South Africa and take the necessary steps that would assist not only in ending the violence in that country, but also ensure that the stalled talks are resumed urgently, leading to the early establishment of a non-racial constitution and a democratically elected Government in South Africa.

The recent developments in South Africa, in particular the cycle of violence which culminated in the Boipatong massacre, cannot but disturb all men of conscience and lovers of peace. These killings have naturally created

(Mr. Nwachukwu, Nigeria)

an atmosphere of fear, uncertainty and mistrust in South Africa. The killings have also seriously jeopardized the peaceful process of transition to a non-racial democratic South Africa. While the National Peace Accord stressed the responsibility of all South Africans in the maintenance of peace as a conducive atmosphere for free political activity, my delegation firmly believes that it is the primary responsibility of the Government of South Africa to maintain law and order and protect the lives and property of its citizens.

(Mr. Nwachukwu, Nigeria)

Unfortunately, we cannot but observe the inability of the South African Government to meet this obligation to society. It was for this reason that my President, General Ibrahim Babangida, in his address to the Dakar Summit of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), called again on the South African Government to assume its full responsibility in this direction. It must equally be said that the liberation movements should themselves assume their own responsibility in this regard. The Government of South Africa and all leaders of the South African peoples should do everything possible to dissuade the perpetrators of violence in South Africa from engaging in the wanton carnage.

We maintain the view that the end of violence will facilitate the reopening of negotiations which will rekindle hope in that country. We call for the creation of conditions that will allow a return by all to CODESA. My delegation also firmly believes that it is in the interest of all South Africans for the democratization process to continue in order to enable the emergence of a united and non-racial democratic South Africa. Most importantly, all sides must agree to negotiate in good faith.

We, as a country, have followed the evolution of events in South Africa, some with satisfaction but some, unfortunately, with consternation and despair. We have, however, remained convinced that there is a compelling need for all avenues to be explored, both within South Africa and outside it, in order to bring the situation under control. It is for this reason that the Security Council has been requested to address this issue by our continental organization.

We fully support the presentation made by the Senegalese Foreign Minister on behalf of the Organization of African Unity. While we welcome the

(Mr. Nwachukwu, Nigeria)

initiative of Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali in suggesting a good will mission to South Africa, we firmly believe that the problem at hand requires at least a two-prong approach if the issue of violence is to be effectively tackled.

Two months ago the OAU monitoring or fact-finding team on violence visited South Africa and had useful discussions with all those concerned. The report of that mission was submitted to the OAU Summit in Dakar last month. For this Security Council debate, what we believe is important is the immediate implementation of the conditions requested by the ANC and all the liberation movements in South Africa. We also believe it is correct to observe that, since the OAU team arrived in South Africa on that mission, the township violence has virtually disappeared. Different parties are, of course, entitled to different conclusions from that observation, but one thing cannot be denied, namely, that the presence of an outside monitoring body of OAU ambassadors brought with it a salutary effect to the townships. Our OAU team was there on the ground for less than two weeks and such lowering of the violence level was noticeable. The organization has decided to send another monitoring team to South Africa for a much longer period. If we, in our humble way, could make such a noticeable impact, what then could a United Nations mission not achieve in a different environment.

We see no reason why the Security Council cannot act now on the request of the OAU. The Secretary-General, in consultation with all the parties involved, can work out the modalities of carrying out our proposal, recognizing that our primary objective is to put an end to violence and intimidation and thereby to help create a climate conducive to successful negotiation and transition to a non-racial and democratic society in South Africa.

We believe that the Security Council shares our hopes and aspirations for a new South Africa which can be a pillar of cooperation and development in our subregion and a new South Africa of which all its peoples can be proud.

Peace is indivisible and a threat to peace anywhere is a threat to peace everywhere.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Congo, His Excellency Dieudonne Antoine Ganga. I welcome His Excellency and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. GANGA (Congo) (interpretation from French): The delegation of the Republic of Congo takes great pleasure, Mr. President, in seeing you presiding over the work of the Security Council. Like my colleagues who have spoken before me, I should like to congratulate you. The friendship, fraternity and cooperation that bind Congo to your country, Cape Verde, unquestionably contribute to the development of fruitful relations within the Organization of African Unity.

My thanks go to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Belgium, with which we have close bonds of friendship, for the competent manner in which he presided over the work of the Security Council last month.

As this is the first time that I have spoken in this Council, I wish to extend a greeting to Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Secretary-General of the United Nations. He has our best wishes for the discharge of his weighty responsibilities.

(Mr. Ganga, Congo)

In the last few years the process of reform in South Africa has taken on unprecedented scope, which has been marked by historic milestones, such as the release of the President of the African National Congress (ANC), Nelson Mandela, whose presence among us we warmly welcome today. Also, more recently, we have seen the National Peace Accord concluded on 14 September, which brought together in the same momentum for progress among its principal signatories, the Government, the African National Congress and Inkatha. Other gestures and significant political measures which have been welcomed with satisfaction by the international community then followed, in particular the constitutional negotiations between the opposition and the Government. CODESA, the Convention for a Democratic South Africa, has thus imposed its authority in the new South African political landscape.

All of this momentum for reform and the progress achieved were described in the introductory remarks which Congo strongly supports. Those remarks were very well presented to the Council on behalf of the Organization of African Unity by my colleague and friend, Mr. Djibo Ka, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal.

For that reason I shall not dwell at great length on this subject. But I want to draw the Council's attention to the political violence, whose unfortunate virulence is a constant reminder to all that the situation in that country, and its future, remain precarious.

A particularly awful example of this endemic violence took place on 17 June: an event of destruction among the members of the majority black community of South Africa - a majority, but completely denied the exercise of power. South Africa's townships experience this kind of tragedy nearly every day. Yet the massacres on the night of 17 to 18 June 1992 in the Boipatong shantytown served as an abrupt and painful reminder of the extreme, blind violence of past years that would be ignited as a method of government, to such an extent that some observers trustworthy to the regime did not hesitate to speak of the precariousness of the political situation in South Africa. Three months after the referendum supporting President De Klerk's reforms - in which only the members of the white community could vote - there has been a resurgence of all the fears that accompany the laborious efforts to settle South Africa's vital problems: human rights, the democratic process and constitutional negotiations.

I note that the most recent annual report by the United States Congress on human rights as practised in each country states that the process of reform in South Africa continued in 1991 but that it was marred by frequent and serious incidents of political violence which, from January to November, resulted in a conservative estimate of 2,050 deaths. This United States congressional report also found that the black majority in South Africa

(Mr. Ganga, Congo)

continues to be denied sovereignty, to be the victim of rampant discrimination as a result of the laws and practices of the dominant system. The report states that South Africa continues to be governed by a parliamentary regime elected by a small white minority:

> "The whites, 13.5 per cent of the population, retain a monopoly of formal political power".

There can be no doubt that the last pillars of apartheid have been dismantled, that the Security Act has been revised and that political prisoners have been released. The Government finally accepted the return of political exiles under the auspices of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

In its 1992 report, Amnesty International has affirmed that President De Klerk's Government has continued the process of dismantling apartheid. But it also asserts that there is considerable testimony accusing the police and army special-forces units of having participated in political murders, of having abetted the perpetrators of such acts, or in certain cicumstances of having shown bias in favour of one party against the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC).

The radicalization of the ANC - if we can thus describe it - was no mere chance. Its President, Mr. Nelson Mandela, in his important address at the beginning of this debate, spelled out for the Council the exact dimensions of the situation.

The principal task of the Security Council under the Charter is to maintain world peace. Today, the Council should carry out that task by trying to end the endemic violence in South Africa which is inflicting great

(Mr. Ganga, Congo)

suffering on the black community and which could well drag South Africa - indeed, the whole subregion - into a terrible disaster.

Congo condemns political violence in South Africa. We have been following with concern its consequences for the delicate democratic process that began two years ago. The tragic massacres in Boipatong township are fratricidal and heinous, and are to be condemned; we cannot fail therefore to wonder about the responsibility of any Government to guarantee the security of its citizens and to protect their property. The fragility of the thread of dialogue so painstakingly spun by the President of the ANC, Mr. Nelson Mandela, and by the President of South Africa, Mr. Frederik De Klerk, only reflects the great importance of this.

The international community and all persons of vision in the South African communities must prevent the Boipatong massacre - the bloodiest since 1990 - from leading to an irreconcilable confrontation between the forces of progress in the various communities of the South African people. The South African patriots, for their part, must realize that they stand to gain nothing from the prolongation of an inhuman, non-democratic, racial system, a system that has been condemned. They must put an end to the violence, conduct an inquiry and bring the guilty to justice. Those on the other side must realize that the failure inherent in not resuming the constitutional negotiations would dangerously perpetuate subjugation and the spectre of violence and ethnic hatred. Both sides, with the help of the international community, must find the determination to return to the negotiating table for the sake of a new, democratic South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Congo for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is His Excellency Mr. Ibrahim A. Gambari, Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. GAMBARI (Nigeria), Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid: It is always an honour and a privilege to appear before the Security Council. I am therefore grateful for the opportunity given me in my capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid to address the Council on the question of South Africa.

That the Security Council is once again seized of the question of South Africa is a sign of the times we live in and of the grave concern with which the international community views the political developments in that country. In the course of the Council's deliberations on this subject, members will hear of the significant developments that have taken place in South Africa since February 1990. But such developments, welcome and laudable as they may be, are now being seriously undermined by the persistent political violence in that country.

(Mr. Gambari, Chairman,
Special Committee against
Apartheid)

Certainly, despite the temptation for the international community and South Africans in particular to pause and acclaim these positive developments, we can ill-afford to do so, for several reasons.

First, it cannot be over-emphasized that the continuing political violence in South Africa has put in jeopardy the peaceful negotiation process and transition to a non-racial democracy.

Secondly, we cannot be oblivious to the fact that, while some key apartheid legislation has been repealed, legacies of apartheid and institutions that long sustained that institutionalized form of racial domination remain intact.

Thirdly, the conditions set out by the international community within the framework of the 1989 United Nations Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa are yet to be fulfilled in their entirety.

May I remind the members of the Council that the consensus Declaration adopted at the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly set down specific guidelines for the process of negotiations in South Africa. These guidelines were categorical in expressing the views of the entire membership of this Organization on the necessary criteria for a successful process of peaceful transition to a democratic non-racial society.

To dispel any doubts, permit me to recall also the pertinent provisions of that Declaration:

> "We are of the view that the parties concerned should, in the context of the necessary climate, negotiate the future of their country

(Mr. Gambari, Chairman,
Special Committee against
Apartheid)

and its people in good faith and in an atmosphere which, by mutual agreement between the liberation movements and the South African regime, would be free of violence. The process could commence along the following guidelines:

"(a) Agreement on the mechanism for the drawing up of a new constitution based on, among others, the principles enunciated above, and the basis for its adoption;

"(b) Agreement on the role to be played by the international community in ensuring a successful transition to a democratic order;

"(c) Agreed transitional arrangements and modalities for the process of the drawing up and adoption of a new constitution, and for the transition to a democratic order, including the holding of elections" (A/RES/S-16/1, para. 8).

Today South Africa is on the brink of disaster. Violence is rife and the South African authorities seem hesitant to advance the negotiations to their logical conclusion and in good faith. The task before the Council has already been spelt out by African States when they requested this meeting. It is

> "to examine the issue of violence in South Africa and to take all appropriate action to put an end to it as well as to create conditions for negotiations leading towards a peaceful transition towards a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa" (S/24232, Annex, para. 4).

There are two critical questions that must be addressed by this Council. Both have the capacity to undermine peace and security in South Africa, and consequently in the southern African sub-region. The first is violence; the

(Mr. Gambari, Chairman,
Special Committee against
Apartheid)

second is the deadlock in the political negotiations. I will address each issue separately.

The blame for political violence in South Africa must rest primarily at the door of the Government of the day. The South African Government, as the administrative authority, has full moral responsibility for the security of life, liberty and property of every South African citizen, as well as that of the State. In both respects, the Government has failed.

I wish to recall that the Secretary-General, in his Soweto Day address on 16th June, pointed out clearly that

> "Violence serves no useful political end, and most certainly is not conducive to peace and stability" (A/AC.115/PV.657, p. 9-10).

This is a notion I believe we all share. But certainly, the raging violence in South Africa seems geared at achieving a sinister motive: that of derailing the process towards a non-racial democracy in South Africa. If not, how else does one explain or justify the South African Government's wilful failure to implement the agreement it freely entered into within the framework of the National Peace Accord adopted on 14 September 1991? Can we believe that a State with a proven security capability to enforce a national state of emergency cannot contain this violence?

In the past four months, there has been an average of 15 deaths daily in South Africa attributed to political violence. Confirmed figures put the death tolls for the months of March, April, May and June at 437, 356, 296 and 373, respectively. Ample evidence also exists in inquiries and investigation reports of respectable organizations on violence and the degrees of culpability. In every instance, the South African Government's culpability is glaring - even if only by acts of omission. A case in point: Under the

(Mr. Gambari, Chairman, Special Committee against Apartheid)

National Peace Accord, certain responsibilities devolve on the South African Government, particularly its security forces. A few among these are worthy of recall:

"(a) The police shall endeavour to protect the people of South Africa from all criminal acts and shall do so in a rigorously non-partisan fashion, regardless of the political belief and affiliation, race, religion, gender or ethnic origin of the perpetrators or victims of such acts;

"(b) The police shall endeavour to prevent crimes and shall attempt to arrest and investigate all those reasonably suspected of committing crimes and shall take the necessary steps to facilitate the judicial process;

"(c) The police shall be guided by a belief that they are accountable to society in rendering their policing services and shall, therefore, conduct themselves so as to secure and retain the respect and approval of the public;

"(d) The police, as law enforcement officers, shall expect a higher standard of conduct from its members in the execution of their duties than they expect from others, and in pursuance hereof, supports prompt and efficient investigation and prosecution of its own members alleged to have acted unlawfully and shall commit itself to continue the proper training and retraining of its members in line with the objectives of professional policing and the principles set out in this Accord."

Despite these clearly enunciated responsibilities of the security forces, today we confront overwhelming police complicity in circumstances of

(Mr. Gambari, Chairman,
Special Committee against
Apartheid)

violence that threaten the very fabric of South African society. But perhaps what is most troubling is the wilful refusal by the De Klerk administration to employ its full administrative, legislative and executive powers in controlling the raging violence.

Beyond these acts of omission, there are other grounds for adducing Government's complicity in the violence. First, it was the Government that legalized the carrying of dangerous weapons on the grounds that they are cultural weapons.

Secondly, the Government is responsible for the conduct of its military proxies, such as the CCB death squads, Koevoets and Buffalo Battalion 32, trained outside South Africa by the SADF and brought into South Africa. In a belated but still very welcome development, the South African Government is reported to have decided to disband these awful military and paramilitary units.

Thirdly, the Government reneged on the agreement to phase out single-quarter hostels in the townships or at least convert them into fenced-off family units, even after acknowledging that violence emanated from them.

Finally, the Government must bear full responsibility, even if only indirectly, for the conduct of its agencies that invariably results in inadequate police investigations, sham trials and unwarranted acquittals of perpetrators of violence, ineffective jail sentences and bails and police cover-ups.

As the Goldstone Commission Report issued last April concludes:

(Mr. Gambari, Chairman,
Special Committee against
Apartheid)

"Well documented criminal conduct by individual members of the South African Police and the KwaZulu Police exacerbate the perception of so many South Africans that the Government or its agencies are active parties responsible for violence."

I might add that this viewpoint has also gained currency internationally. The recent report on violence of the International Commission of Jurists, as part of its conclusion, notes that "... cynics might suggest that the violence can be used as a reason to postpone the elections for a Constituent Assembly, but this is not an option. If the violence is not stopped now", the report continues, "it will run out of control and become endemic and there will be no winners. It is also having a very adverse effect on the economy. Violence is the most pressing problem which South Africa faces."

(Mr. Gambari, Chairman, Special Committee against Apartheid)

These are the realities in South Africa, the proliferating violence included. No one, least of all members of this Organization, takes delight in frivolously accusing the South African regime of complicity in the violence, but the facts speak for themselves, as does the escalating death toll. Perhaps the acts of commission or omission on the part of the administration are best summed up by the views expressed by Anthony Lewis in an article in the New York Times, of 6 July 1992. The article concludes that:

> "At minimum, Mr. de Klerk and his colleagues have been grossly insensitive and dilatory on the violence issue. When alleged killers are arrested, nothing seems to happen. Nine policemen were charged in a massacre at Sobokeng two years ago; they remain on duty. With all the attacks on the trains, exactly one person has been tried and convicted."

All one can add to this unsavoury assessment is that the South African Government appears to have abdicated its most elementary responsibilities to its citizens and the State. None the less, the prevailing climate of political violence confronts all South Africans with a profoundly tragic and dangerous circumstance that undoubtedly is an impediment to the peace and stability of that nation. The Security Council should, therefore, call upon all parties to the National Peace Accord to act in concert to implement its provisions and collectively give peace a chance in South Africa.

On the question of the stalled political negotiations, one hardly needs to reiterate the imperative need for a negotiated settlement to the South African problem. Whereas negotiations within the framework of CODESA have positively advanced the political process, they now appear to be bogged down at a most crucial junction - and that is the vital and inevitable question of constitution-making. That the South African regime has elected at this stage to create an impediment to the negotiations raises serious questions as to its sincerity of purpose and long-term commitment to a non-racial democracy in that country.

Two salient factors at play must be underscored. First, time-honoured democratic principles, which are universally accepted, and which define true democracies, cannot be subverted in South Africa on the grounds that majority rule in that nation is tantamount to black domination. Secondly, while demands for guarantees that protect minority rights are natural and desirable, they must not be allowed to be the basis for establishing a white minority veto that could easily disrupt the normal functioning of a non-racial democratic society.

In this respect, I can only echo what the President of the African National Congress, Mr. Nelson Mandela, said recently, that "constitution-making should be a unifying and legitimizing process which should enjoy overwhelming support". One does not see how this could be achieved if the administration holds on tenaciously to positions that do not help South Africa advance towards a non-racial democracy but only strive at protecting some minority interests.

The role of the Council and the international community at large in helping to ensure that the deadlocked negotiations in South Africa are resumed cannot be overstated. But, fundamentally, a curious question has arisen as to whether or not there is a grand strategy aimed at facilitating South Africa's re-entry into the international community and the lifting of global

(Mr. Gambari, Chairman, Special Committee against Apartheid)

sanctions - all without really relinquishing power in that country. This is the vital question the Council must bear in mind in the course of its present deliberations.

Without taking up any more of the Council's precious time, I wish to conclude my remarks by stating that the Council has an obligation under its Charter mandate to act immediately on the situation in South Africa. Beyond that, the international community has a moral responsibility for the implementation of the 1989 United Nations Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa.

I have just returned from London, where I was attending an International Hearing on violence in South Africa and the implementation of the National Peace Accord. There, I heard the convincing and dramatic testimony of South Africans and others with firsthand experience of the violence, and their appeal to the international community to live up to this moral responsibility. I should also like to refer in particular to the concluding remarks by Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, a copy of which I requested be transmitted to the members of the Security Council.

The international community now calls on the Council to respond to the situation in South Africa. Various suggestions have been made, ranging from the introduction of international monitors to oversee the implementation of the Peace Accord in particular, and law enforcement in general, to direct involvement in the political negotiations so as to guarantee neutrality of both the convener and the venue. Recent experiences of political violence in other nations should compel the Council to act in a timely manner. There is a broad spectrum of possible action that can be taken.

(Mr. Gambari, Chairman, Special Committee against Apartheid)

Finally, allow me to add that the founding fathers of the United Nations were dedicated to the proposition of the indivisibility of peace as enshrined in the Charter of the Organization. Therefore, the Security Council, as the organ of our Organization charged with the primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, must demonstrate clearly that the tragic, recurrent and escalating loss of life in the black townships of South Africa is no less deserving of its prompt, concrete and effective response than the loss of life in Sarajevo, in the former Yugoslavia.

South Africa poses a new challenge to this Council and the United Nations. We cannot fail to respond accordingly.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Australia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): We are watching with admiration, Sir, the way in which you are presiding over this Council.

Thank you for the opportunity to address the Security Council at this special meeting on the serious situation in South Africa.

Developments in South Africa have been of longstanding concern to Australia. Successive Australian Governments strongly condemned the injustices of apartheid - the deaths, the arbitrary arrests, the gross inequalities and the lack of opportunities for those without white skins.

Australia, with many other countries, was active in international forums, and in bilateral representations and contacts, in bringing pressure on the South African Government to dismantle apartheid. Many of our policies were

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

developed within the Commonwealth of nations and its Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa. It was the Commonwealth Heads of Government in Harare in October 1991 who adopted a phased approach to the lifting of sanctions, whereby sanctions would be removed on a step-by-step basis as progress towards a non-racial democracy was achieved. We believe that this approach has contributed in a real way to the pressure for change in South Africa.

Australians were quick to welcome the decision by the South African Government to begin the process of dismantling apartheid and to enter into negotiations with the other parties in South Africa. Australians welcome the fact too that at the critical time in its history South Africa has leaders like Nelson Mandela, who, despite their personal experiences, have demonstrated a truly impressive willingness to pursue reconciliation and a negotiated, constitutional settlement.

Australia is deeply dismayed that the constitutional negotiations have broken down and talks in the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) have been suspended. We recognize the factors contributing to the breakdown in talks, in particular the continuing violence on a major scale in South Africa. Australians were sickened by the horrendous massacre of women and children in Boipatong on 17 June. We have urged the South African Government to bring those responsible to justice as quickly as possible and to act on the recommendations of the Goldstone Commission of Inquiry. We have also urged all parties in South Africa to exercise restraint at this critically difficult time.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

We have heard the calls for international involvement in South Africa to support a return to the negotiating table and to help bring an end to the bloodshed. In this context it is imperative that the international community respond to the ongoing loss of life and continue to support the drive for human rights in South Africa. We earnestly hope that international involvement will help create a climate of confidence so that the current impasse over negotiations can be overcome and the violence eliminated.

We share the views of many of those who have spoken in this debate, reflected in the draft resolution, that the time has come for direct involvement in South Africa. There is clearly a need for prompt, effective and constructive action by the United Nations and other international agencies to stem the violence and restore confidence in the constitutional negotiations.

Australia agrees with the proposed draft resolution that, as a first step, a Special Representative should be appointed to recommend measures which could bring an effective end to the violence and assist in creating conditions for negotiations leading towards a peaceful transition in South Africa. We consider that the precise form of any further United Nations involvement should await the outcome of the report by the Special Representative to the Security Council.

We note that various options have been mentioned: a goodwill or fact-finding mission, a peace-keeping presence, the establishment of a Special Representative office, among others. In determining the final nature of United Nations involvement, the Security Council will, we hope, give due weight to the needs and wishes of all parties in South Africa.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

It will be important that there be close consultation and coordination between the various international organizations concerned with the situation in South Africa, so that support is provided in a complementary and mutually reinforcing way. We believe that there will be considerable scope for cooperation between the United Nations and other organizations, such as the Commonwealth, particularly in reinforcing the Peace Accord and in supporting the local peace committees established under the Accord.

Accordingly, the Australian Government believes that this Security Council meeting should be seen as the beginning of a concerted international campaign to restore a climate for the elimination of violence and the resumption of negotiations within South Africa, and not as an end in itself.

In conclusion, Australia is ready to contribute in an active and positive way to this process. Prime Minister Keating and Foreign Minister Evans have stated publicly Australia's commitment to support and to participate in international mechanisms that are acceptable to all the parties in South Africa and that contribute to the early achievement of non-racial democracy.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Second Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uganda, His Excellency Dr. Ssemogerere, whom I welcome. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. SSEMOGERERE (Uganda): On behalf of the Uganda delegation, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July. I take this opportunity to commend the Government and the people of Cape Verde for conducting a successful electoral exercise which led to a peaceful and democratic transfer of power in

(Mr. Ssemogerere, Uganda)

your country. I assure you of my delegation's cooperation in the discharge of your responsibilities.

Allow me also to express our sincere appreciation to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Paul Noterdaeme, Permanent Representative of Belgium, for the able manner in which he presided over the Council during the month of June.

I also take this opportunity to congratulate His Excellency Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali on his well-deserved election to be Secretary-General of the United Nations.

My statement is made merely to underscore the seriousness of the issues so far raised, in particular by my colleague and brother, His Excellency Mr. Djibo Ka, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Senegal, representing the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity. I should also like at the outset to express my delegation's appreciation to the Council for holding these special meetings to give us all an opportunity to consider what is happening in South Africa. I am very pleased with the general tenor of the presentations made so far about South Africa and the constructive suggestions made, which are reflected in the draft resolution before the Council.

Mr. President, you are presiding over the Council at this crucial moment when it is considering the grave issue of the escalation of political violence in South Africa targeted at black communities and, in particular, the heinous massacre at Boipatong township on the night of 17 June 1992 and the subsequent shooting of innocent, unarmed demonstrators by elements of the South African security apparatus. The Council is also meeting at a time when the negotiations within the framework of the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) are at the point of near collapse because of the escalation of violence. For this reason, the Council has a special responsibility to ensure that violence, especially because of the inherent threat to regional peace and security associated with it, is curbed to pave the way for a resumption of negotiations.

Hopes were raised when the Pretoria regime joined the other parties in signing the National Peace Accord and in instituting CODESA. These were positive developments in and for the process of peaceful negotiations and a transition to a democratic, non-racial South Africa.

There is no doubt that the negotiations in South Africa were not, by any means, conducted among equals. The Pretoria regime has a major strategic advantage and leverage in the entire process, owing to its monopoly over the media and economic, political and military power in the country. Nevertheless, the African National Congress (ANC) and other nationalist forces went an extra mile by agreeing to join that process, with the hope of contributing towards peaceful democratic change in South Africa.

For the negotiations to resume and succeed there is need therefore to address the imbalances in the entire process, and this has been stated clearly by the Foreign Minister of Zimbabwe. This requires all parties to exercise understanding in a spirit of give and take, especially with respect to the issue of constitutional principles over which agreement has to be reached if South Africa is to emerge as a democratic, non-racial society. This Council and the international community have a duty and responsibility to continue supporting those parties legitimately striving for a peaceful, democratic change in South Africa. In this vein, my delegation appeals to all parties in South Africa to give full support to the negotiating process.

I had the privilege of being a member of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) Observer Group which, along with the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement, the European Economic Community (EEC), and the Commonwealth representatives, visited South Africa as observers of CODESA II, in May 1992. From my experience, then, I do not have any doubts about the considerable influence the South African Government has over the entire negotiating process. The South African Government has therefore the obligation and the means to take steps to remove all obstacles to negotiations, to build the necessary confidence in the same, and to make clear its commitment to internationally approved principles of constitutional democracy.

My delegation is also deeply concerned that the South African Government has done little to dispel accusations that elements in government, especially in the security forces, are fuelling violence. The massacre in Boipatong is a case in point where evidence points to the fact that elements on the South African Government payroll and housed in the single-sex hostels, were responsible for the massacre. Circumstantial evidence also points to the fact

(Mr. Ssemogerere, Uganda)

that the relevant security authorities were alerted before the massacre took place, but elected not to take any preventive measures. As if that was not enough, security personnel subsequently deployed in the area also joined in the mayhem: they shot and killed innocent people.

It is, therefore, untenable for the Pretoria regime to claim or pretend that it is unaware of the root causes of the persisting political violence in South Africa, that it is uninvolved in its perpetuation or unable to curb it. The South African Government cannot be exonerated from involvement in the political violence and the consequent stall in the CODESA process.

The Pretoria regime must muster the courage to live up to its responsibilities and the expectations of the international community by guaranteeing security of life and property of all people in South Africa, regardless of race, colour or political affiliation. It is inexplicable that the South African Government, with all its powers, has not been able to do so over a long period, resulting in the death of more than 11,000 people over the last five years.

The prevailing political violence in South Africa is not conducive to confidence-building among the peoples of South Africa, between South Africa and the neighbouring front-line States, or between South Africa and the rest of Africa. This violence has negative effects on regional and international peace and security. We should not forget that for a long time countries in the region were victims of violence inspired from South Africa. Unless the prevailing political violence inside South Africa is stopped, there is a danger of its spilling over to the rest of the region and the rest of the continent.

(Mr. Ssemogerere, Uganda)

A democratic, non-racial South Africa offers great potential for all peoples of South Africa, for the front-line States, and for the rest of Africa; through economic, technical, technological and socio-cultural cooperation. The Treaty Establishing the African Economic Community provides a useful framework for such cooperation in Africa. A democratic and non-racial South Africa can make a major contribution to the attainment of the objectives and goals enshrined therein.

We urge the Council to demand of the South African Government that it take immediate measures to investigate all incidents of violence and prosecute promptly all those involved, including members of its security apparatus. It is only then that new confidence can be built among the oppressed peoples in South Africa and in Africa in general. The regime must implement fully and faithfully all the provisions of the National Peace Accord, including agreements regarding single-sex hostels, the prohibition of the carrying of dangerous weapons in public, the demobilization of foreign mercenary units in the South African Police and Defence Forces and the effective protection of public transport users. It is only then that an atmosphere conducive to the resumption of peaceful negotiations can be said to be in place.

Finally, we believe that the situation in South Africa has reached a point for the United Nations Security Council to be seriously involved in the drama unfolding there. The United Nations has the responsibility to prevent the situation from further deteriorating and getting out of control. Peace in the region is at risk; and so are the lives and property of hundreds of thousands of people there. We therefore urge the Security Council to mandate

(Mr. Ssemogerere, Uganda)

the Secretary-General to appoint as a matter of urgency a Special Representative to investigate the underlying causes of the ongoing violence and to submit appropriate recommendations to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Second Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda for his kind words addressed to me.

I will now suspend the meeting for consultations.

The meeting was suspended at 8.05 p.m. and resumed at 9.30 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Canada. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

Ms. FRECHETTE (Canada) (interpretation from French): First of all, I should like to congratulate you most sincerely, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council and to pledge Canada's full cooperation as you carry out your task.

We meet at a critical time for South Africa, and for those who have worked so hard against the evil system of apartheid. It is very important that this issue is being addressed at the Security Council level. We encourage the efforts that are being made to develop a coordinated international response by organizations such as the United Nations and the Commonwealth.

The past two and a half years have seen positive changes in South Africa. Last December, we welcomed the start of multiparty negotiations towards a non-racial, democratic South Africa. It is not appropriate for Canada or for any other country to prescribe a particular constitutional model to South Africans. It is our conviction, however, that a political settlement must be secured through a process of peaceful negotiations and ratified through free and fair elections.

(spoke in English)

But the fight for peace, justice and equality is not yet over. The issue of violence and the tragic massacre in Boipatong township have put in jeopardy the future of the negotiations. Despite the National Peace Accord, signed in September 1991, the incidents of violence have increased to alarming roportions. As a result, the fragile confidence that was beginning to build within South Africa has been severely damaged.

(Ms. Fréchette, Canada)

There is great anger in South Africa at the senseless loss of life. There is frustration that the perpetrators of these heinous crimes have too often not been apprehended and charged. For millions of South Africans, violence affects their lives every day and violates their fundamental human rights: freedom of movement, freedom of expression, freedom from fear. If South Africa is to transform its society and assume its place among the nations of the world, the violence must end.

Clearly the Government of South Africa must make far greater efforts to ensure that the security forces protect and are trusted by all South Africans, whatever their race or political affiliation. It must bring to justice those who have committed criminal acts. In this context, the announcements yesterday by President De Klerk of measures to counter violence, including the disbanding of controversial military units, are welcome steps. But ending the violence will not be a simple task nor will it happen quickly. All groups share responsibility for the continuation of the violence and all groups must accept responsibility for ending the current cycle of aggression, blame and mistrust.

None of us here would underestimate the difficulties that lie ahead for South Africa. Certainly not Canada. In April, the Honourable Barbara McDougall, our Secretary of State for External Affairs, who chairs the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa, visited South Africa. During her trip she discussed with the South African parties the serious implications for the constitutional discussions of the growing level of violence. She stressed the need for greater effort on all sides to end the violence and to encourage a climate of democratic tolerance.

In the wake of Boipatong, Mrs. McDougall wrote to both President De Klerk and Mr. Mandela to reiterate these concerns. She indicated that the Boipatong

(Ms. Fréchette, Canada)

massacre needed to be investigated in a manner acceptable to all parties and the findings acted upon. She suggested that international observers, acting in support of the National Peace Accord might be able to play a useful role in moving South Africa beyond this tragic period towards a non-racial and peaceful democracy.

In recent weeks, Mrs. McDougall has been in close touch on this issue with the Commonwealth Secretary-General, with her CFM colleagues and with South African leaders.

The recent visit to South Africa of Chief Anyaoku and the discussions in which Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali has been involved may help us to find a way forward. A course of action must be identified to deal with the violence and enable the parties to return to the negotiations. Flexibility and compromise will be required on all sides. We must find a pragmatic means to restore the climate of confidence which is essential to break the current dangerous impasse. We would urge the Security Council to endorse the proposal to send a Special Representative of the Secretary-General to South Africa in order to assist in creating these conditions.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Sweden. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. OSVALD (Sweden): I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I am sure you will discharge your duties in a most commendable way.

At this decisive time for the future of South Africa, violence casts a shadow over the progress achieved so far in the negotiating process. The Swedish Government, which for many years has supported the cause of democracy in South Africa, is deeply concerned by this continuing violence and by the present standstill in the negotiations. The negotiations made considerable

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

progress in the past few years. We were particularly encouraged by the important steps taken towards democracy through the work of the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA). For the first time the majority of the South African population has taken part in negotiations on the country's constitution.

In recognition of the positive trends and successive political agreements in South Africa, the Swedish Government has declared that it is prepared to let these developments be reflected in its relations and cooperation with South Africa. The Swedish Government has also declared that it will consider the lifting of sanctions against South Africa in accordance with the actual progress being achieved within South Africa.

There is no alternative to the reform process. It must continue and be brought to a successful conclusion to make possible a peaceful and prosperous future for all South Africans. This process deserves the full support and encouragement of the international community.

We must, however, recognize that violence constitutes a grave threat to the continuation of the reform process and to the possibilities of finding a peaceful and lasting solution to the South African challenge.

The Swedish Government has repeatedly condemned the continued violence in South Africa. It has declared that the South African Government must consider the situation carefully and shoulder its responsibility to protect the lives and property of all citizens. Other parties involved must also take their full responsibility and forcefully combat violence in accordance with the Peace Accord signed last year.

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

At this juncture we must ask ourselves what role the international community, and in particular the United Nations, could play in the efforts to bring about democracy in South Africa.

Almost three years ago the General Assembly unanimously adopted the Declaration on Apartheid and Its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa. By this Declaration, the world community for the first time spoke with one voice to condemn the abhorrent system of apartheid.

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

Today, the time has come for the United Nations to act decisively. It should assist the parties in their efforts to put an end to the devastating violence, which has claimed more than 1,800 lives this year alone. The reform process within the framework of CODESA must, as I said, be put back on track. Here too the United Nations could play an important role by helping to create conditions that would allow those involved in the process to overcome their mistrust and lack of confidence.

These elements are reflected in the draft resolution now before the Council.

Let me assure members that the Swedish Government will give its full support to the forthcoming decision of the Security Council and to the Secretary-General in this matter. We also pledge our readiness to contribute to them in whatever way we can.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Sweden for his kind words addressed to me. The next speaker is the representative of New Zealand. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

Ms. WILLBERG (New Zealand): New Zealand congratulates you, Sir, on your assumption of the office of the presidency for the month. We also thank the Security Council for this opportunity to speak here today. I want first to register both our deep concern at the impasse in negotiations in South Africa and our support for their earliest resumption. We are deeply concerned too by the recent violent events in South Africa exemplified so tragically at Boipatong.

We welcome the convening of this special meeting. It follows the initiative of South African leaders to approach the United Nations. Initial discussions at the time of the recent OAU Summit in Dakar were held between

(Ms. Willberg, New Zealand)

the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the South African Foreign Minister and the leaders of the African National Congress and the Inkatha Freedom Party. It is important that these representatives and others in the CODESA negotiations are attending this session.

It is New Zealand's hope that the Council's good will and constructive approach will encourage a determination both to return to the negotiating table as soon as possible and to bring the violence to an end. So much has already been achieved to consign the iniquities of apartheid to history. Those efforts must not be allowed to falter now. There is much still to be done. We see in the politics of drift and recrimination the greatest danger to hopes for creating a truly democratic and non-racial South Africa. The aim of all of us must be to put the negotiations in South Africa back on the rails.

For negotiations to succeed, the problem of violence must be tackled. This tragic legacy of apartheid is wrecking the trust needed to build a new South Africa. It is growing in scale and in ferocity. Those perpetrating violence, or acquiescing in it, must be made to answer. Its containment will require concerted action and discipline. All parties in South Africa, and particularly those in authority, must intensify efforts to bring bloodshed to an end and those responsible to justice.

As the Council considers a possible role for the United Nations, we believe that certain principles should guide it. As the tragic decades of apartheid showed, solutions cannot be imposed from outside. International action cannot itself take the place of national resolve and negotiation. But it can, in South Africa's case, help create the essential confidence and trust which the parties themselves need to preserve the gains of the CODESA process

(Ms. Willberg, New Zealand)

and to go forward. It is our hope, then, that this Council's decisions will be specific, practical, directed to early implementation, and acceptable to all in South Africa. To this end, New Zealand supports the prompt dispatch of a United Nations Special Representative to South Africa, to undertake consultations and to report back to the Council.

Over many years, New Zealand has given firm support to Commonwealth action against apartheid. Our Prime Minister confirmed to the Commonwealth Secretary-General, when they met in our capital recently, that New Zealand would consider participating in further Commonwealth initiatives agreed by the major parties in South Africa.

New Zealand is pleased that the South African Government is willing to listen to the views of the United Nations. The step of accepting outside counsel is always a particularly sensitive one, but it can bring helpful, new perspectives. What is usually required is compromise from all parties. In this connection, it is the view of my Government that any resolution adopted by the Security Council should reflect this quality of compromise and the need for moderation. It should stand against the politics of confrontation and brinkmanship.

We salute the remarkable progress which the South African leaders have achieved so far in their negotiations. It will take great courage and determination to move further towards democracy for all of that country's people. But there is no acceptable alternative and no other way to reach it than through negotiation.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of New Zealand for her kind words addressed to me. The next speaker is the representative of Nepal. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ACHARYA (Nepal): It gives me great pleasure to extend to you, Sir, the warm felicitations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for July and my good wishes for your success. I also have the pleasure to express appreciation to Ambassador Paul Noterdaeme of Belgium for his skilful stewardship of the Council's business during the month of June.

I also wish to take this opportunity to express my delegation's appreciation to Mr. Nelson Mandela, a visionary leader and statesman, for his presentation of the situation in South Africa and of the obstacles to political dialogue. I also extend our appreciation to Mr. Makwetu, President of the Pan Africanist congress of Azania (PAC), for his presentation.

Apartheid represents the most blatant violation of the guiding principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Its eradication has been one of the most focused missions of this Organization since its founding. A landmark achievement of this mission has been the Declaration adopted unanimously by the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly. That declaration constitutes a universally accepted framework for a negotiated end to apartheid, which stands as a stark anachronism in a rapidly changing international order.

We believe that while the Declaration spells out the prerequisites for a climate suitable for negotiations and lays down guidelines for the process of negitiations, it is up to the people to work out details for the peaceful transition to a united, non-racial, democratic South Africa. Nepal has followed with cautious optimism movements in the last two years towards this goal. We applaud the statesmanship, vision and forbearance displayed by the leadership of the national liberation movements despite the long years of

(Mr. Acharya, Nepal)

injustice, oppression and persecution. We have also noted the repeated commitment of the minority Government to negotiations for the establishment of a non-racial, democratic society.

(Mr. Acharya, Nepal)

The Government and the people of Nepal have no illusion that the complex process of change in which South Africa is currently engaged will be smooth. Violence is an inextricable part of apartheid; it survives on and promotes violence, for the system itself is the ultimate negation of all norms of human decency. The Declaration of the sixteenth special session recognizes, in paragraph 8, the linkage between an atmosphere of violence and the process of negotiations. The very complexity of the negotiating process has given rise to reaction and antagonism. Continuing violence and senseless carnage have threatened to derail negotiations since the beginning. Our optimism, however, was sustained by the fact that negotiations, though halting, remained on course. The carnage perpetrated at Boipatong therefore came as a rude shock to us.

My delegation fully understands the pain and outrage felt by the majority people of South Africa at the carnage. The latest in the chain of tragedies has renewed charges of complicity of the State security apparatus in the violence. The outrage has brought to a standstill the fragile process of negotiations.

Indeed, negotiations will be devoid of all meaning as long as the families of the oppressed people continue to live in fear of assault and murder. Boipatong and all previous tragedies are sad commentaries on the failure of the minority Government to fulfil the primary duty of a Government - to safeguard the most basic right to life and property of its citizens. Jurists, international fact-finding missions and human rights groups have repeatedly pointed the finger at the criminal conduct of members of the security forces. The Government has expressed regret at the massacres, but its actions fail to indicate any serious attempt to control violence. The

(Mr. Acharya, Nepal)

regime seems totally incapable of understanding the depth of anger and frustration among the majority people.

Despite complexities, the negotiations thus far have indicated that difficulties in the establishment of a united, non-racial, democratic South Africa are not insurmountable. The Boipatong tragedy threatens a collapse of the whole process. My delegation appeals to all the parties concerned to do whatever is necessary to end this tragic cycle. The first and foremost responsibility rests with the South African Government. Unless justice is done, and seen to be done, the dream of a new South Africa could vanish.

The response of the international community needs to be fine-tuned to the complex and delicate situation in South Africa today. A combination of pressure and encouragement needs to be suitably applied, bearing in mind that the ultimate goal is the establishment of a non-racial, democratic society in South Africa. To that end, my delegation welcomes the proposal to appoint a Special Representative of the Secretary-General, with a clear mandate to identify the causes of violence and propose measures to put an end to it. This should form the basis of action by the Security Council to create conditions conducive to the resumption of the negotiations.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Nepal for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Suriname. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. NANDOE (Suriname): I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. You bring to this high office a wealth of experience, and I am confident that you will guide the Council's work to success. I should also like to thank your predecessor, the

(Mr. Nandoe, Suriname)

Permanent Representative of Belgium, and to express my deep appreciation for the outstanding manner in which he presided over the Council's work last month.

In December 1989 our Organization attained a major objective in its global campaign against apartheid by adopting the historic Declaration on Apartheid and Its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa. That Declaration delineates the common objective of the international community to establish, through peaceful means, a united, non-racial, democratic South Africa.

Positive steps have been the repeal and amendment of some of the legislative pillars of apartheid and the Convention for a Democratic South Africa. The contribution of President De Klerk to these achievements should be recognized.

However, on many occasions many responsible leaders have stated that the South African Government should stop the violence and protect the life and property of all its citizens.

It has been stated time and again that the Government of South Africa can no longer repackage with impunity the tenets of apartheid by promising the future end of white domination while allowing its security forces to suppress the anti-apartheid opposition.

As so many speakers have stressed, the escalating violence in South Africa continues to demonstrate the inability, or even the unwillingness, of the South African authorities to put an end to it. The massacre at Boitapong township, on the night of 17 June 1992, and the subsequent shooting of unarmed protesters by the army and police of the South African regime are the latest blatant violations of human rights. According to the latest report of Amnesty

(Mr. Nandoe, Suriname)

International, hundreds of opponents of the minority Government of South Africa are victims of politically motivated killings carried out by the security forces with the acquiescence of the Government.

The same report informs us that though the South African authorities have announced various inquiries into such killings, those responsible have rarely been brought to justice.

Hope and desire, certainly among the members of the united front for a new and better South Africa, were alive until CODESA collapsed. Hatred and frustration are mounting, especially among those generations whose relative discipline and patience are becoming less.

South Africa is at a crossroads. The violence has seriously jeopardized the process of peaceful negotiations and the transition towards a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa.

The South African regime has the obligation to create the climate necessary for meaningful negotiations. This means that immediate measures must be taken to bring an effective end to the ongoing violence. President De Klerk must unify and heal his country by admitting the fundamental wrong of apartheid. A *mea culpa*, a public renunciation, would be an enormous symbolic act.

The African National Congress (ANC) has given its conditions for its return to the negotiations. Those conditions are reasonable.

International observers should be brought in to monitor the policing of the townships. Perhaps outsiders will not bring immediate peace, but they could give policemen cause to hesitate before using violence, and at the same time expose the truth about the situation in the townships.

(Mr. Nandoe, Suriname)

Suriname therefore believes that the request contained in draft resolution S/24288 that the Secretary-General appoint a Special Representative is appropriate. This renewed United Nations involvement could help the peace process, and the Special Representative could play an important and constructive role in the interests of the majority of the people of South Africa.

We sincerely hope that reason and good sense will prevail.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Suriname for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Indonesia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia): Mr. President, at the outset, I should like on behalf of my delegation to express appreciation to you and to other members of the Council for giving us the opportunity to participate in these deliberations. Allow me to extend to you, Sir, my delegation's congratulations upon your assumption of the Council's presidency for this month. We are confident that, with your extensive experience and diplomatic skills, you will guide the proceedings to a successful conclusion. I should also like to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor for his able leadership of the Council in June.

Let me avail myself of this opportunity warmly to welcome Mr. Nelson Mandela, the President of the African National Congress (ANC), and to congratulate him on his important address to the Council. My appreciation goes also to Mr. Makwetu of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) for his lucid presentation.

This meeting has been convened to deal with the disturbing developments taking place in South Africa which makes it incumbent upon my delegation to participate in these debates.

For some time now political tensions in South Africa have been increasing in the wake of a stalemate in talks between the racist regime and anti-apartheid leaders. There has been concern that the negotiations under the auspices of the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) could break because of the insistence that certain provisions of the new

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

constitution be subject to a veto by the minority, which has cast an ominous shadow on the peaceful transition to majority rule. Furthermore, the potential for destabilization by extremist groups also remains a cause for deep concern.

The situation has been markedly exacerbated by the escalating level of violence which has already taken a heavy toll in human lives. My Government was particularly appalled by the recent gruesome massacre at Boipatong Township. These wanton attacks have shown that the perpetrators are determined to terrorize township communities and create chaos in the country at large. Regrettably, the collusion of the security forces and the regime's ineffectual response to the killings of innocent men, women and children have shaken the confidence of the black majority in the impartiality of the Government. These developments therefore constitute a serious setback to the continuation of any meaningful negotiations and to the eradication of apartheid.

It is obvious that notwithstanding the important milestones on South Africa's irreversible course of reform, the regime's duplicitous policies have reinforced suspicion of its intention to perpetuate minority rule. Its failure to prevent the spiralling violence, aided and abetted by the security forces, provides an unambiguous confirmation of this belief and cannot but intensify the resistance to racial domination.

In this context, my delegation endorses the decision taken by the Organization of African Unity at its meeting held last month in Dakar, Senegal, which inter alia called for an urgent meeting of this body to investigate the causes of violence, to take necessary measures and to create conditions conducive to a peaceful transition in South Africa. Unless the

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

Council proceeds to take action as a matter of urgency, the situation in South Africa may deteriorate further with unforeseen consequences. The international community can no longer countenance barriers to justice and equality, and the South African Government must be held accountable for its policies. The need for action has become imperative in view of the manoeuvres of the regime to perpetuate apartheid, which are bound to impact adversely on the ongoing endeavours for a negotiated solution.

It is Pretoria's responsibility to control township violence and to maintain law and order. My delegation therefore calls upon the Pretoria regime not to exploit the rivalries that divide a frustrated and impoverished majority or to foment unrest in the country.

Over the past two years, developments of far-reaching importance have taken place in South Africa leading to the establishment of a post-apartheid society. In this regard, my delegation extends its full support for the CODESA process, which we hope will be resumed to make a renewed and determined effort to finalize the terms for the transitional period.

It is pertinent to recall that the Non-Aligned Movement has since its inception called for the dismantling of institutionalized racism in South Africa. Hence, at this critical stage in the struggle for a non-racial and democratic society, it is incumbent upon us to call upon the Government of South Africa to move decisively and quickly in resolving the deadlock over the transfer of power and to build a new society. The voices of the disenfranchised and oppressed can no longer be silenced. Racial reconciliation, equality of rights and majority rule will triumph and the people of South Africa will become free.

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

To conclude, my delegation would like to lend its support to the proposal that the Secretary-General appoint a Special Representative in order to assist in bringing an effective end to the violence and in order to create conditions for negotiations leading to a peaceful transition to a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Indonesia for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Antigua and Barbuda. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. HURST (Antigua and Barbuda): Mr. President, thank you very much for allowing me to speak on behalf of the 12 States that are members of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). I therefore speak tonight in one voice for the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago and, my own country, Antigua and Barbuda. I shall nevertheless be very brief.

We are most pleased to see Cape Verde presiding over this eminent body at this moment in history, and we congratulate the Security Council for the important work it has undertaken most recently in addressing so many international crises. Its focus upon Africa today is also most welcome.

At the 13th meeting of the Conference of Heads of Government of the CARICOM, which was held in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, from 29 June to 2 July 1992, our countries' leaders reviewed developments in South Africa as they have historically done at previous annual CARICOM summit meetings. They immediately joined in the call for an emergency session of the United Nations Security Council, issued at the time of their meeting by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) simultaneously convened in Dakar, Senegal.

(Mr. Hurst, Antigua and
Barbuda)

It was with a sense of disquiet that our Heads of Government examined the level of violence directed principally against members of the African National Congress and they specifically condemned the massacre of more than 40 innocent Africans at Boipatong. The gross inhumanity of this slaughter and its adverse implications for the negotiating process which is intended to lead to a free South Africa, moved our Heads of Government to pledge their fullest support for an international investigation of this massacre.

Today, this historic Security Council meeting must succeed in bringing to an end the escalating violence in South Africa. The peace and security of the region is premised on a democratic, united and non-racial South Africa emerging from negotiations. The South African authorities must thus take all necessary measures immediately to stop the violence which deprives innocent victims of life; the authorities must exercise effective control of the police and security forces, for failure to do so returns the entire region to a state of grave danger.

The evil and the illegality of apartheid cannot long survive; thus, apartheid's peaceful demise would allow swift emergence of a democratically elected Government in South Africa. The sooner democracy comes to South Africa, the better off its citizens will be. However, should the South African authorities continue to seek to slow the process by encouraging violence which disrupts negotiations, then our 12 Heads of Government are prepared to play their part in remobilizing the international community to take decisive action.

The draft resolution before the Security Council today which, among other things, requests the Secretary-General "to appoint, as a matter of urgency, a

Special Representative" and urges the international community "to maintain existing measures imposed for the purpose of bringing an early end to apartheid", receives the full support of our 12 CARICOM member States. We urge full acceptance of its terms and pledge to maintain existing economic and financial sanctions against South Africa until an interim Government is established.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister of External Relations of the People's Republic of Angola, His Excellency Mr. Pedro de Castro Van-Dunem. I welcome His Excellency and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Pedro de Castro VAN-DUNEM (Angola): Sir, I should like first of all to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council, in the certainty that your well known and proven capabilities will be made available in directing the work of this extremely important organ of the world Organization. In your capacity as a native of a country of the family of African countries of Portuguese official language your exercise in itself of the presidency of this organ constitutes for me a great honour and satisfaction.

I should also like to extend to Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali my most cordial congratulations on his well deserved election to the high position of Secretary-General of the United Nations. I have found in him a great friend and distinguished African.

It is a great honour for me and for my delegation to be able to participate in this most important debate dealing with the complex situation prevailing in South Africa. We hope to make our modest contribution to the

(Mr. Pedro de Castro Van-Dunem,
Angola)

solution of the problems for which its martyred and suffering peoples have been struggling for long decades.

We have listened with particular attention to the statements made by Nelson Mandela and Clarence Makwetu, Presidents of the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, respectively, on the developments taking place. The gravity of the situation and the lack of prospects for a rapid solution of the conflict, which has a potential for unforseeable and hard to control developments, are of great concern to us and darken the optimism with which everyone has been imbued - the peoples of South Africa, Africa and the international community.

My country, together with all other countries of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), has strongly and unequivocally supported the efforts and steps being taken by President De Klerk towards the abolition of apartheid in South Africa and has supported the measures for the gradual lifting of sanctions against that country as a form of stimulating all actions aimed at the eradication of apartheid. In that perspective, it has studied and implemented measures aimed at normalizing relations of all types between our two countries.

President De Klerk's victory in the April referendum brought to the peoples of South Africa the hope and confidence that the solution to the conflict, which was sought for so long, was in sight.

Unfortunately, this enthusiasm was short-lived, since the country was immediately plunged into a wave of violence in which the protagonists were mainly the black peoples with the participation of the South African police

(Mr. Pedro de Castro Van-Dunem,
Angola)

and mercenary troops remaining in South Africa and specially created and developed to stifle the peoples of the southern region of the continent, with particular attention to Namibia, Angola and Mozambique, and to promote general destabilization in order to permit the survival of apartheid.

In this regard, I must state here my deepest concern regarding the flagrant violations of the New York Agreements concerning implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia by the South African Government. Thanks to the passivity of the international community, that Government steadfastly refuses to disband its forces - namely, Battalions 31 and 32, also known as the "Buffalos", "Crowbars" and "Bushmen" - as provided for in those Agreements.

As an Angolan, I must declare my deepest abhorrence of the fact that citizens of my country participated in the massacre of defenceless civilians in South Africa - namely, in Boipatong.

I reiterate in this Chamber the need for the Security Council to take the strongest steps possible towards the immediate disbanding of those forces before they commit any more atrocities, not only in South Africa, but also in Mozambique, Angola or any other country in our region.

Today, with the end of the cold war, the world is generally living in a dynamic of peace and a perspective of democratization unparalleled in recent times. The African continent, with some exceptions which we still deplore, has not escaped that trend. We understand that these factors are fundamental, even essential to the creation of the conditions for economic revival. Considering the potentials and capabilities of all kinds that southern Africa has, we cannot remain indifferent to what is happening in South Africa, not only because that country does not make itself eligible to participate in the effort towards the economic integration of the region, but also because it continues to constitute the major focus of tension, with direct consequences for the country and the other countries of the region.

In this context, we reiterate our full support for the declaration made at the emergency meeting of the National Executive Committee of the African National Congress of South Africa on 23 June last; this has already been presented at the Dakar summit, with great effectiveness, during its consideration of this problem.

We appeal to President De Klerk to order the immediate cessation of all acts of violence that are victimizing defenceless South African citizens, and we reiterate the need to resume dialogue - open, frank and constructive dialogue where the principles of flexibility, of give and take and of seriousness are applied in the interests of all the peoples of South Africa.

We reiterate the need to appoint a United Nations representative to monitor, step by step, the implementation of the measures aimed at the final solution of the conflict and at the establishment of a democratic, non-racial South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for External Relations of Angola for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MUJICA CANTELAR (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish at the outset, Sir, to greet you and to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July. That a representative of the Republic of Cape Verde, an African country that has demonstrated its commitment to devote all necessary efforts to the eradication of apartheid, is presiding over this meeting augurs well for the success of the Council's deliberations and for the Council taking action that will make an effective contribution to the emergence of a united, democratic, non-racial South Africa.

I wish also to congratulate the representative of Belgium, Ambassador Paul Noterdaeme, on the distinguished and effective way in which he guided the work of the Council in June.

We believe that the convening of this Security Council meeting had become a pressing necessity. We had been witnessing with concern how the process that began in South Africa in 1990, aimed at eliminating the hateful policy of apartheid, risked being thwarted by the resurgence of various forms of violence: violence resulting from the activities of the most retrograde forces in that country and threatening a rising toll of victims. We had also been watching with concern how, despite the slow pace of the measures that had been taken and the still uncertain direction of the process, certain members of the international community were taking premature and, in our view, still unjustified decisions which, by relaxing international pressure on the apartheid regime, encouraged the sectors most resistant to change, even giving them the leeway to try to halt the emergence of a just society in South Africa.

Today's situation is largely the result of that policy of indulgence towards one of the most hateful practices on Earth and, it must be said, of the inertia - to put it mildly - of those powerful Governments that worked and, paradoxically, continue to work to diminish the role and the contribution of the various United Nations organs with respect to the struggle towards the final eradication of apartheid.

In this very Security Council we have seen time and again how action has been taken to prevent "sending the wrong signal" to one or another party on the international scene, while, when dealing with apartheid South Africa, nothing was done to prevent a "wrong signal" being sent, through indulgence and inertia, to those who oppose urgent change in that part of southern Africa.

We hope the question of South Africa and the violence besetting that country will now get the attention and consideration it deserves, following the commendable and timely action taken by the Organization of African Unity in requesting this meeting of the Security Council on a subject which, of course, has been on the Council's agenda for many years.

We agree that, on the basis of the draft resolution that has been submitted and that has been considered in private for several days, the Council should condemn the massacre perpetrated in the town of Boipatong on 17 June and other similar acts. We agree too that it is necessary to stress the responsibility of the Government of South Africa to guarantee the safety

(Mr. Mujica Cantelar, Cuba)

of all its citizens, to take the measures necessary to end the violence in that country and to protect the lives and property of all South Africans, and to create a climate of confidence that will enable the negotiating process to proceed. We firmly believe that the Declaration on Apartheid and Its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa, adopted less than three years ago at the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly, and the measures it contains are and will remain fully applicable so long as apartheid persists and so long as its effects continue to be felt by the people of South Africa and by neighbouring States, posing a threat to international peace and security in the region.

The Security Council has the inescapable duty under the Charter to address not only threats to peace and security that arise in proximity to the sources of strength of the great Powers or in areas that provide resources for the industrialized world. The Council has the duty to address, and act upon, all issues that threaten peace and security in the world, irrespective of where they may occur, of the forces that may be involved in them and of the great Powers' strategic interests in them.

(Mr. Mujica Cantelar, Cuba)

The fact that more than 50 States Members of this Organization have requested this meeting of the Security Council, and the solid response that this request has elicited among the States Members of the United Nations, as seen in the number and the quality of the statements made in this Chamber today, shows that there is a widespread interest in knowing, in fullest detail, how the Council will approach each facet of this issue and what subsequent delibrations it will engage in.

We hope that with the appointment of a special representative of the Secretary-General and the report that this person will prepare, the international community as a whole will be given access to detailed information about the true causes of violence in the country in question, the forces that promote it and the unspoken objectives that they pursue; and we hope to be able to take effective measures leading to the eradication of violence in South Africa and the real, definitive elimination of the practice of apartheid, in all its forms and manifestations, and to the emergence of that united, democratic and non-racist South Africa to which most of the Members of the Organization aspire.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Cuba for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the Philippines, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ARCILLA (Philippines): Allow me first of all, Sir, to congratulate you warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. Your watch comes at a time when the Council is seized of, among others, two issues of critical significance: that of a fledglinq nation crying out for help to enable it to stay alive, and the other of a nation struggling to be born. There is no gainsaying the fact that the Council can and should perform

(Mr. Arcilla, Philippines)

its role under the Charter to assist these two nations to attain their cherished goal.

With you at its helm, we are confident that the Council will try its utmost to see to it that Bosnia and Herzegovina will soon enjoy peace and stability, and that a non-racial and democratic South Africa will not be stillborn and will soon join the family of nations.

The Philippines is deeply distressed by the tragic turn of events in South Africa, in particular by the recurring violence in that country. The unspeakable massacre at Boipatonq Township has jolted us sharply and brought into our consciousness the inescapable and ugly truth that South Africa is hemorrhaging, and little has been done to stop it. This has been even more acutely painful and frustrating, considering the optimism we had two months ago that transitional arrangements would be in place by now had the Convention for a Democratic South Africa succeeded.

That many lives had to be lost before men with the responsibility to do so would act to avert tragedy and correct a wrong is profoundly sad. History is replete with examples of this nature and one would think that we would have learned our lessons by now. The viciousness of the apartheid system is laid bare in the consequences we are witnessing: the violence and the misery visited upon apartheid's victims.

The apartheid laws and statutes may have been stricken down, but the practices, attitudes and concomitant evils of the system have not disappeared. For the people of South Africa, there are no easy paths; only the path of peaceful transition is the wisest one to follow. The path of violence only leads to destruction and intolerable loss of human lives. The Philippines therefore urges all South Africans, in particular the parties involved in the stalled negotiations, not to throw away the gains achieved in the past two years but instead to pursue through negotiations the goal of a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa.

We note that several investigations and inquiries have been made by the Organization of African Unity and by the Commonwealth to identify the roots of violence in South Africa with a view to ending it. These efforts would not be complete without the involvement of the United Nations in stemming the violence and reviving the negotiations in South Africa. The United Nations involvement is a logical consequence of the long-standing objective of this Organization to eradicate apartheid. It is imperative that the United Nations, which hammered out the consensus Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences, to play its logical role in fulfilling the spirit and letter of that Declaration.

The Philippines believes that international pressure, including measures imposed by the Security Council, must continue to be applied and maintained against the South African Government for the latter to comply faithfully with its responsibilities under the National Peace Accord of 14 September 1991. The perpetrators of violence must also be brought to justice speedily, for they are not only responsible for the loss of innocent lives: they have also pushed South Africa to the brink. The alleged complicity of certain security forces in the series of violent acts must be brought to light and not swept under the rug. As the Chairman of the Special Committee Against Apartheid stated,"Security for all members of society is a primary duty that no Government can abdicate".

Much has been lost after the cycle of violence in South Africa. The threat of instability hovers over the whole society. The trust among the parties involved in the negotiations, painstakingly achieved, has now been lost and replaced by an atmosphere of fear, uncertainty and mistrust. In the words of Mr. Nelson Mandela as the African National Congress withdrew from CODESA, "It becomes harder to explain to our people why we negotiate with a government intent on killing us."

The situation in South Africa is at that dangerous stage where violence has riven a society already reeling from the political, social and economic consequences of apartheid. If no action is taken by the international community by way of bringing the parties back to the negotiating table, the Philippines fears gravely for South Africa's future. The Philippines therefore urges the Security Council to adopt unanimously measures that would effectively address the situation in South Africa and prescribe the modality for assisting South Africans to resolve the problem of violence and to resuscitate the negotiations for a democratic future for that embattled nation. Nothing less would be adequate at this time.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Philippines for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Lesotho, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. PHOOFOLO (Lesotho): Mr. President, may I say how very pleased we are to see you having assumed the stewardship of the Security Council this month. We hasten to wish you much success.

(Mr. Phoofolo, Lesotho)

To your predecessor, Mr. Paul Noterdaeme, we say "well done".

The Security Council is once more focussing on the South Africa problem following the senseless and brutal massacre of men, women and children at Boipatong on 17 June 1992. The atrocity of Boipatong was a chilling reminder of political violence that has always been a major obstacle to democratization and the reform process in South Africa.

The political violence engulfing South Africa is the legacy of apartheid. It was in recognition of this fact that the international community adopted on 14 December 1989 the Consensus Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa, which called, inter alia, for the creation of the necessary political climate for negotiations. In enunciating the guidelines to the process of negotiations, the international community expressed the view "that the parties concerned should, in the context of the necessary climate, negotiate the future of their country and its people in good faith and in an atmosphere which, by mutual agreement between the liberation movements and the South African regime, would be free of violence. (General Assembly resolution S-16/1, annex, para. 8). Notwithstanding that Declaration, violence has continued unabated, with an ever-increasing toll on the black people.

The world at large welcomed President de Klerk's move to release political prisoners and the lifting of political bans. In that February 1990 historic pronouncement, President de Klerk appeared to come to a crucial understanding that his Government could no longer govern the country with the exclusion of the majority of South Africans. South Africa appeaed to be crossing a new threshold to an era filled with promise for all its citizens.

(Mr. Phoofolo, Lesotho)

The dramatic release of Mr. Nelson Mandela, President of the African National Congress (ANC), the late Zephania Mothopeng, then President of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), and Mr. Clarence Makwetu, its current President, and other political leaders augured well for a new South Africa. The great leaders of the liberation movement also re-emerged on the political scene without rancour and targeted their efforts and energies towards the elimination of apartheid, en route to negotiations leading to the creation of a non-racial democratic South Africa as the ultimate objective.

We are all witnesses to the road President de Klerk took, starting with the Cape Town Minutes; the Pretoria Minutes; the removal of some legislation which provided the bedrock of apartheid; amendment of the Internal Security Act; the political Peace Accord of 14 September 1991; and the coming into being of the CODESA process, born on 21 December 1991.

Mr. Nelson Mandela and his followers, believing that they were on a genuine path to the ultimate destination, a new, democratic South Africa, continued to negotiate in good faith. The result of CODESA's second plenary session in May 1992 is well known to us all. It was a regrettable outcome indeed. The CODESA process deserves resurrection by all the main political players in South Africa.

While the world was undergoing a revolution of rising expectations that a new order was emerging in South Africa, political violence turned black townships into war zones, and now the country appears to have degenerated into a morass of violence, intolerance, mistrust and racial hostility, brutalizing blacks and whites.

What some of us in Lesotho find hard to believe and to comprehend is that all of a sudden the police force, with the help of the army, which used to

(Mr. Phoofolo, Lesotho)

hunt freedom fighters and "law of the day" violators, is today incapable of policing and maintaining law and order in the very same areas of the country to stamp out violence. It is equally a matter of common knowledge that for years some elements in the security forces were trained and paid to destabilize liberation movements through assassinations, abductions and other dirty tricks that turned southern Africa into a human nightmare.

In the chilling Boipatong massacre, at least 40 people were shot, stabbed and hacked to death. It is reported that police ignored warning of the impending attack from one of the many notorious hostels.

Nowadays, hostels are increasingly used as staging grounds for politically motivated murder. In rejecting the notion of so-called black-on-black violence, particularly as it involves hostels, South Africans of good will and good intentions have all observed that these hostel inmates are incapable of distinguishing between the policies, if they know what "policy" means, of the ANC, Inkatha or the PAC. We continue to reject the notion that in a charged atmosphere, weapons of any kind, including spears and machetes - "pangas" in the language of southern Africa - can be cultural necessities. At Boipatong, it is reported, a spear was used to butcher a nine-month-old baby, and a pamga was used to slaughter a woman eight months pregnant - weapons of cultural necessity!

It remains our steadfast conviction that the responsibility for the protection of innocent lives and property rests primarily with the South African authorities. There must be some understanding of the black pain over the ongoing violence, and appreciation of the depth of anger and frustration in the black community, as a result of what appears to be a failure to contain the political violence.

(Mr. Phoofolo, Lesotho)

It is neither a virtue nor a sound economic principle to appear to be encouraging an increasing role of funeral undertakers or expanding the coffin industry. The traffic leading to the black graveyards should be reduced. The existing police force in South Africa, whose numbers have been reported to have swelled to 110,000, cannot fail to put to an end to the ongoing massacres, should there be a genuine desire to do so by all concerned. For instance, the Law and Order Minister, Mr. H. Kriel, in his recent statement referring to hot spots around the country, said that the Government had "ample provisions" to deal with those hot spots under present security legislation. Those "ample provisions", taken together with the sophisticated and efficient law-enforcement machinery, need to be employed to facilitate the creation of the necessary climate for negotiations encouraged by the consensus declaration.

We continue to take courage from our knowledge that the South African liberation movements are not wedded to armed struggle. As a demonstration of good faith, the ANC swiftly moved to suspend its armed struggle as talks with the South African authorities began. Its inevitable resort to violent means in the past was a response to the violence of apartheid and the rejection by successive South African Governments of all overtures for peaceful dialogue towards the elimination of apartheid and the negotiation of a new Constitution that would usher in a new democratic South Africa for all its citizens.

It is not our intention to catalogue all the pogroms that started in Natal in 1985, culminating with the atrocious Boipatong massacre by the brutes. We genuinely appeal to those in authority in South Africa seriously to address the root causes of this ever-escalating political violence, which is even shamefully instigated by parliamentarians of the likes of

(Mr. Phoofolo, Lesotho)

Mr. Koos Botha, who recently confessed to helping to bomb a formerly white Hillsview High School in Pretoria's northern suburbs last year, in June, in his constituency, a school that was to serve children of black political returnees. We also note the disproving of the so-called "black-on-black violence" notion with the recent sentencing of police officer Captain Brian Mitchell to hang for leading a massacre of 11 innocent black villagers, wounding 8 in rural Natal, at the settlement of Trust Feeds. They were slaughtered simply because this Mitchell thought they were supporters of the United Democratic Front (UDF) which was reported by the apostles of "black-on-black violence" as clashing with Inkatha.

As the Council reaches its decision on the draft resolution before it, we hope it will bear in mind the ugly fact that the average black family in and around the townships lives in constant fear of unpredictable assault and murder, as the recent Boipatong tragedy indicates.

Being predominately Christians, our only immediate neighbours, as they look to the skies also say "eli eli lema sabachthani", and casting up their eyes, ever drenched in tears, they have pinned their hopes on your Council as they say that they too deserve a protection force which hopefully will contribute to genuine negotiations by all South Africans acting in good faith. They too deserve peace.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Lesotho for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. NYAKYI (United Republic of Tanzania): I thank you, Sir, for the opportunity to address the Security Council. In doing so, I should like at the outset to extend to you my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of July. For the African delegations, and the suffering people of South Africa in particular, it is a happy coincidence that you are presiding over the Council's affairs during this debate on violence in South Africa, which is a matter of the gravest concern to our continent and to the world. We are confident that you will bring your great experience and much admired diplomatic skills to bear on the Council's deliberations.

At the same time, I join in the expressions of appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Paul Noterdaeme of Belgium, for the guidance which he provided to the Council in June.

This meeting is about the tragic violence in South Africa. It is about who bears responsibility for it. It is about what the Pretoria authorities should do to put a speedy end to it. It is about what the international community should do to help bring this about. It is not about the resumption of negotiations. In the face of the carnage going on inside South Africa and the immense suffering it has imposed on the majority black population, to put priority on negotiations at this time is not only insensitive in the extreme; it is putting the cart before the horse.

The whole purpose of negotiations is to secure the restoration to the majority people of South Africa of their fundamental freedom and rights. But before they can enjoy those rights, including their inalienable right to self-determination, they must first secure and assert their foremost fundamental right - the right to life. At a time when the pre-eminent

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic of Tanzania)

preoccupation of the world, particularly of the major Powers, is the promotion of human rights, for the world to look at the carnage going on in South Africa as helpless spectators is an indictment of the new world order. Those who cannot bring themselves to assert the most fundamental human right for the innocent people in South Africa's townships forfeit their right to assert it for people anywhere else around the world. The best Constitution in the world is no good for the dead. Nor is it of much use to the living who continue to live in conditions of perpetual terror and fear for their lives. The people of South Africa need a negotiated Constitution for a post-apartheid South Africa. But no one has a right to ask them to negotiate with a gun pointed at their heads.

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic of Tanzania)

It is fitting that the Council should be meeting in an emergency session to consider the grave problem of violence in South Africa. The immediate reason for its convening is the Boipatong massacre of 17 June which shocked the conscience of the international community. Boipatong left more than 40 people dead. Although the outside world has come to accept violence as an endemic problem in South Africa, its scale of perpetration is seldom appreciated. It is only after its perpetration on a massive scale, such as Boipatong, that the world community takes note and responds. Such was the case after the massacre of 69 peaceful protesters in Sharpeville in 1960. The outrage evoked by the regime's brutality gave birth to the world-wide anti-apartheid movement and the wide range of sanctions for which it campaigned. Such was the case also after the Soweto massacre of 1976. The horror provoked by the regime's murderous and repressive acts persuaded even its allies to join in supporting Security Council resolution 418 (1977) imposing an arms embargo - the first and only Chapter VII measure against Pretoria. Security Council resolutions 473 (1980), 554 (1984) and 556 (1984) were all adopted in response to massive repression and brutality following violence in the country.

Yet deaths resulting from violence are a daily occurrence in South Africa. The current phase of violence in the country goes back to 1986. For over five years innocent lives have been perishing in South Africa at the rate of 15 a day, according to records maintained by representatives of the victims of the violence. According to most estimates, the death toll today stands at over 11,000 people. In no other country would such a heavy toll in lives over such a long period of time be accepted as inevitable.

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic of Tanzania)

There was a time when the world community may have entertained genuine doubts about the complicity of the Pretoria authorities in the violence afflicting the country. Now there can be no excuse for exonerating the regime from responsibility for the violence. Only the naive and Pretoria's supporters and their friends accept its characterization of the strife as black-on-black violence. Five years of unremitting violence leading to the loss of more than 11,000 lives and the massive evidence gathered by various sources, including human rights, church and lawyers groups, leave no doubt about the sinister hand of the regime's security forces, including the police and the army in the violence plaguing the country. The involvement has taken the form of planning, funding, training and directing logistical support and even direct participation in attacks and other acts of violence.

In a paper entitled, "South Africa: Evidence of 'Third Force' Destabilization Mounts", published in May 1992, the South African Research and Documentation Centre, provides detailed evidence of numerous acts of police complicity in acts of violence committed by the Inkatha Freedom Party supporters, such as recruiting people, providing training and arms, providing escorts, turning a blind eye to Inkatha violence, and the like. An article by Christopher Wren in the New York Times issue of Wednesday, 12 June 1991, based on the revelations of a retired South African Army Major, Nico Basson, corroborates what has been revealed in the Centre's paper. In these circumstances the regime can have no interest in stopping the violence.

Those members of the international community who have formed the habit of casting doubt on the claims of the liberation movements cannot ignore the

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic of Tanzania)

findings of the Government-appointed Goldstone Commission which states in paragraph 2.3.7 that:

> "A history over some years of State complicity in undercover activities which include criminal conduct ... and well-documented criminal conduct by individual members of the South African Police and the Kwazulu Police exacerbate the perception of so many South Africans that the Government or its agencies are active parties responsible for the violence. The Government has failed to take sufficiently firm steps to prevent criminal conduct by members of the security forces and the police and to ensure that the guilty are promptly and adequately punished."

Sometimes Pretoria's attempt to cover up its criminal conduct gives it away. Recently the Minister of Police sought a court injunction to prevent the Weekly Mail from publishing a report on the existence of a highly clandestine police network in the Southern Transvaal region. If, as the leaders of the liberation movements have warned, the regime had nothing to hide, why did it seek to prevent publication of the report?

Even if it was not involved, through complicity, in the violence plaguing the country, Pretoria cannot run away from its responsibility to end it. As a writer in the New York Times asserted in an article in the issue of Thursday, 9 July 1992, the debate on involvement or non-involvement of the Government in the violence, whether directly or indirectly, is no longer relevant. Holding that the Government must be held accountable, the writer argues:

> "In any other State in the world and as a product of the basic terms of the social contract, a Government is charged with providing bodily security for its citizens."

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic of Tanzania)

As the liberation movements, the PAC and the ANC, have made clear in their statements, what the Government must do to end the violence is clear. In a nutshell, it must put an end to the complicity of its security forces in undercover activities. Specifically, it must implement the measures it has promised to undertake to end the violence, such as the closure of the single-sex hostels and the banning of the carrying of the so-called cultural weapons. It must bring to justice security personnel involved in violence and vigorously investigate all criminal activities. It must suspend from duty all security personnel implicated in criminal conduct. It must disband all security units and South African Defense Force detachments engaged in covert operations, such as Battalion 32, and others comprised of foreign nationals.

Boipatong taught the international community a number of painful lessons which must be kept in mind in planning an appropriate response to the crisis. One of them is that some members of the world community were in too much of a hurry to lift sanctions. Feeling secure from the pressure of sanctions and isolation, the Pretoria authorities now feel emboldened not only to ignore their undertaking to take steps to end the violence but also to drag their feet at the negotiating table. None of this surprises those delegations, like mine, which have continued to campaign for the maintenance of sanctions. The first responsibility of this Council, therefore, must be to reaffirm the need for continued pressure on the regime. Existing sanctions must be maintained.

(Mr. Nyakyi, United
Republic of Tanzania)

In this connection, I would like to use this opportunity to reaffirm the determination of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa, which I have the honour to Chair, to continue vigorously to pursue its mandate as reaffirmed by the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly. On behalf of the Intergovernmental Group, I urge members of the Council and the world community as a whole to continue to extend their support and cooperation to the Group.

Boipatong also painfully reminded the international community that, in regard to the violence, it had for too long relied too much on the regime's investigative machinery. Although the world community never fully endorsed it, its acquiescence in it bestowed a credibility never deserved. Now the Security Council has an opportunity to repair the omission in a way that helps not only to stem the tide of violence in the country, but also to restore the confidence and trust of the oppressed in the negotiating process.

These, I believe, are the objectives of the draft resolution before the Council initiated by the African countries. I join previous speakers in urging the Council to adopt it.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania for his kind words addressed to me.

In view of the lateness of the hour, I intend to adjourn the meeting now. With the concurrence of members of the Council, the next meeting of the Security Council to continue the consideration of the item on the agenda will take place tomorrow, Thursday, 16 July 1992, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.10 p.m.